Anti-Slavery Standard Vol. 11-12

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SIDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. | Without Concealment...Without Compromise. | EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors.

VOL. XI....NO. 6. | NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 4, 1850. | WHOLE NO. 526.

Published Weekly, BY THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, AT 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS: TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. GAY, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. GAY, New-York.

Norris & Brother, Printers.

The Slavery Question.

SPEECH OF GEORGE W. JULIAN, OF INDIANA,

Delivered in the House of Representatives, May 14, 1850.

In Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, on the President's Message transmitting the Constitution of California.

Mr. JULIAN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN—Representing, as I do, one of the strongest Anti-Slavery districts in the Union, I feel called upon to express, as nearly as may be, the views and feelings of my constituents, in reference to the exciting and painfully-interesting question of slavery. I am not vain enough to suppose that anything I may say will influence the action of this committee; yet I should hereafter reproach myself were I to sit here day after day, and week after week till the close of the session, listening to the monstrous heresies, and I am tempted to say the impudent bluster, of southern gentlemen, without confronting them on this floor with a becoming protest in the name of the people, I have the honor to represent. Sir, what is the language with which these gentlemen have greeted our ears for some-months past? The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLINGMAN] tells us, that less pauperism and crime abound in the South than in the North, and that there never has existed a higher state of civilization than is now exhibited by the slaveholding States of this Union; and so in love is he with his "*peculiar* institution," which thus promotes the growth of civilization by turning three millions of human beings into savages, and prevents them from becoming paupers by converting them into brutes, that he gives out the threat, doubtless in behalf of his southern friends, that unless they are permitted, under national sanction, to extend their accursed system over the virgin soil of our territories, they will block the wheels of Government, revolutionize the forms of legislation, and involve this nation in the horrors of civil war. Nay, he goes farther, and anticipating the triumph of northern arms, and comparing the vanquished "chivalry" to the Spartans at Thermopylæ, he kindly furnishes the future historian with the epitaph which is to tell posterity the sad story of slaveholding valor: '*Here lived and died as noble a race as the sun ever shone upon,*' fighting (he should have added) for the extension and perpetuation of human bondage!

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BROWN] manifests an equal devotion to the controlling interest of the South. He declares that he "regards slavery as a great moral, social, political, and *religious* blessing to the slave, and a blessing to the master." The celebrated John Wesley was so "fanatical" as to declare that "slavery is the sum of all villainies." Had he lived in this enlightened age and Christian land, he would have learned that, on the contrary, it is the sum of all blessings. He would have been told that ever the Bible sanctions it as a divine institution; [illegible] southern gentlemen remind us that it "existed in the tents of the Patriarchs, and in the households of his own chosen *people*;" that it was established by decree *of* Almighty God," and "is sanctioned in the *Bible*—in both Testaments—from Genesis to Revelation;" and so sacredly is it to be cherished, that we in the North are not allowed to give utterance to our deepest moral convictions respecting it. My friend from Mississippi graciously admits that we think slavery an evil; but he adds, "very well, think so; but *keep your thoughts to yourselves.*" Thus in the imperative mood and characteristic style of a slave driver are we to be silenced. In this "freest nation on earth," our thoughts must be suppressed by this slaveholding inquisition. We must, I suppose, make a bonfire of the writings of Whittier, and expurgate our best literature. Indeed, to be consistent, and in order to eradicate every trace of "fanaticism" from the minds of the people, we must blot out the history of the American Revolution, and "keep our liberty a secret," lest we should give offence to the immaculate institution of the South. Of other institutions of society we may speak with the utmost freedom. We may talk of northern labor and northern pauperism. We may advocate with tongue and pen the most radical schemes of reform, and thus assail every existing form of civilization. We may discourse freely of things even the most sacred, as the Supreme Being, His attributes and providence,—yes, in this boasted land of free speech, we may deny his existence, or blaspheme his name by invoking his sanction of the most Heaven daring crimes; but *American slavery* is an institution so precious, so beneficent, so exalted among the ordinances of God, so "sanctioned and *sanctified* by the legislation of two hundred years," that northern men are not permitted to breathe an honest whisper against it. We must hold our tongues and seal our lips before the majesty of this southern Moloch, lest he should lose some of the victims which otherwise his worshippers might sacrifice upon his blood-stained altar.—Oh! the devouring loveliness, the enrapturing beauties, the unspeakable *beatitudes* of the "patriarchal institution!" And what a blessed thing it must be to live in the pure atmosphere, and under the clear sky of the South, feasting upon philosophy and reason, far removed from the folly and "*fanaticism*" of the North!

And the gentleman from Mississippi, like his friend from North Carolina, is in favor of extending the blessings of slavery at all hazards. The South *will* not submit to be girdled round by free soil; and if we dare to thwart her purpose, we are reminded of the struggle of our fathers against British tyranny. Southern gentlemen point us to the battle-fields of our Revolution, and bid us beware. A northern man, especially if disposed to be "fanatical," would suppose that our southern brethern would avoid such allusions. Our fathers, it is true, resisted the aggressions of the mother country "at all hazards, and to the last extremity;" but their resistance was not in behalf of slavery, but *freedom*. Mr. Madison declared in 1783, that "it was the boast and pride of America that the rights for which she contended were the rights of human nature." And Mr. Jefferson said, that "*one hour*" of this American slavery, which has been so recently transfigured into all blessedness, "is fraught with more misery than *ages* of that which we rose in rebellion to oppose." In speaking of an apprehended struggle of the blacks to rid themselves of their bondage, he affirmed that "the Almighty has no attribute which can take sides with us in such a contest." Yet southern gentlemen appeal to our revolutionary history as a warning to us, and a justification of a war on their part, not for the establishment, but for the *subversion* of liberty and the *destruction* of "the rights of human nature," by the indefinite extension over free lands of that system of bondage which the very soul of Jefferson abhorred. All this to northern men seems strange. As a specimen of southern philosophy it may be very creditable to politicians from that quarter, and it may appeal powerfully to their patriotism; but we cannot comprehend it. Nothing short of the serene understanding and unclouded vision of a slaveholder can penetrate into the marrow of such arguments in defence of the South.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORTON] makes war upon the ballot-box. He says it has become "sectional;" and a distinguished gentleman in the other end of the Capital, after charging it with being the parent of the Anti-Slavery agitation and its apprehended disasters to the country, pronounced it "worse than Pandora's box." We in the North have been taught that a constitutional majority should rule. We believe this principle lies at the foundation of our free system of government. We have been so "fanatical" as to regard the ballot-box as the palladium of our liberty. But our slaveholding brethren have discovered that this suppose safeguard of freedom is in fact an engine of mischief. It is the dreaded instrument by which this Union is to be broken into fragments. How we should get along in a Democratic government without it, I am not able to explain; and I regret that southern gentlemen, whose minds are free from any "fanatical" influence, have not seen fit to enlighten us on that subject.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELLBORN] assails the dogma that "men are created equal:" he styles it "a mystical postulate," although our fathers regarded it as self-evident truth. They, I suppose, lived in the twilight of political wisdom; for since I have had the honor to occupy a seat on this floor, I have on more occasions than one heard southern gentlemen denounce Jefferson as a sophist, and the Declaration of Independence as a humbug. And some of these gentlemen, strange to tell, coolly style themselves *Democrats*! Why, we are told that so far from being created equal, men are not created at all. Adam alone was a *created* man.—Neither are men born. Infants are born, and grow up to the estate of manhood; but men are neither born nor created. The *equality* of men is declared to be absurd for other reasons. Some men, we are told, are taller than others, some of a fairer complexion, some more richly endowed with intellect; as if the author of the Declaration of Independence had meant to affirm that men are equal in respect to their physical or intellectual peculiarities!

Mr. Chairman, I will speak seriously. I need not further multiply these examples of southern opinion and feeling. I have brought them forward because, while the cry of "northern fanaticism" is incessantly ringing in our ears, I desire the country to judge whether a much larger share of fanaticism does not exist in the southern States; and whether this slaveholding fanaticism is not infinitely less excusable than that which prevails in the North. Sir, I can respect the man who, under the impulse of philanthropy or patriotism, deals his ill-judged blows at an institution which is crushing the dearest rights of millions, and now seeks at all hazards to curse new regions with its presence; but it is difficult to respect the slaveholder, who, with his foot upon the neck of his brother, sits down with his Bible in one hand and his metaphysics in the other, to argue with me, that the truths of the Declaration of Independence are mere sophisms, and that the forcible stripping of three millions of human beings of all their rights, even their humanity itself, receives the sanction of the Almighty, and is a blessing to both tyrant and slave. This is a species of fanaticism above all others the most distasteful, the most preposterous, the most revolting. I will not undertake to combat these absurdities of its champions; for it has been said truly, that to argue with men who have renounced the use and authority of reason, and whose philosophy consists in holding humanity in contempt, is like administering medicine to the dead, or endeavoring to convert an atheist by Scripture.

Mr. Chairman, we hear much of northern and southern aggression. Nothing is more current in southern speeches and newspapers than the charge that the people of the free States are *aggressing* upon the rights of the South; and this Union, it seems, is to be dissolved, unless these aggressions shall cease. On the other hand, the people of the free States charge [illegible] to the enticement of the slave and plead not [illegible] hold[illegible]. Now, how stands the case? Who *is* the aggressor? This is the question to be solved, and the one I propose mainly to examine. I wish to do this fairly and dispassionately; for I am fully aware of the differences of opinion which prevail in regard to it, resulting, perhaps necessarily, from the different circumstances of the parties.

The charge of northern aggression I certainly deny. It has no just foundation. Neither is the charge of southern aggression, perhaps, fully and strictly true. The truth rather seems to be, that under the lead of southern counsels, both sections of the Union have united in enlarging and aggrandizing the slave power. This proposition I shall endeavor to establish.

What are these northern aggressions of which we have heard so much complaint? Of what hostile acts do they consist? Have the people of the free States attempted to interfere, by law, with Slavery in the South? This charge, I am aware, is frequently brought against us. You can scarcely open a newspaper from that quarter in which it is not gravely made. It has been again and again denied by northern men on this floor, but southern gentlemen still continue to repeat it. Sometimes it is preferred against the people of the North generally, but more frequently against a comparatively small portion of them as the Free-Soil party. The charge is utterly unfounded in truth. The Whigs and Democrats of the North, as well as the Free Soil men, disclaim all right on the part of Congress to touch the institution of Slavery where it exists. We all agree that the subject is beyond our control. As regards the naked question of constitutional power, Congress has no more right to abolish Slavery in South Carolina, than it has to abolish free schools in Massachusetts—no more right to *support* Slavery in the one State than in the other. It is an institution dependent wholly upon State sovereignty, with which the General Government has no more concern than with Slavery in Russia or Austria. It is true, that some of us in the North claim the right to assault Slavery with moral weapons, even in the States. When the slaveholder says to us that on this subject we must keep our thoughts to ourselves, we shall obey him if it suits us. We have a right to employ those moral forces by which reforms of every kind are carried forward. We understand the power of opinion. We believe, in the language of Dr. Channing, that "opinion is stronger than kings, mobs, Lynch-laws, or any other laws for the suppression of thought and speech;" and that, "whoever spreads through his circle, be that circle wide or narrow, just opinions and views respecting Slavery, hastens its fall." Sir, it is not only our right, but our duty, to give utterance to our cherished moral convictions; and if Slavery, rooted as it is in the institutions and opinions of the South, cannot brave the growing disapprobation of Christendom, let it perish. And it will perish. If, by "re-enacting the law of God," we can prevent its extension, the South will be constrained to adopt some plan of gradual emancipation. She will realize forcibly the important fact, which she now endeavors to overlook, that truth, justice, humanity, and the spirit of the age, are all leagued against her system. I will not harbor the impious thought that an institution, so freighted with wretchedness and wo, is to be perpetuated under the providence of God. I cannot adopt a principle that would dethrone the Almighty, and make Satan the governor of the moral world. It is "the fool" who "hath said in his heart there is no God." Nor do we mean to be silenced by the hackneyed argument that Slavery is a *civil* institution, and therefore none of our business. We deny that the public laws of a community can sanctify oppression, or stifle the expression of our sympathy for the oppressed. Your Slavery, when intrenched behind your institutions, is still Slavery; and although your laws may uphold it, they cannot repeal that Christian law, which teaches the universal brotherhood of our race. But while I thus frankly avow these sentiments, I repeat what I have already said, that the people of the North claim no right, through the action of the General Government, to interfere with Slavery in the slaveholding States. We most emphatically disavow any such purpose. Are we, then, guilty of aggression upon the rights of the slaveholder?

We are charged with violating the clause in the Federal Constitution relative to fugitives from labor. This is among the gravest accusations preferred against us. Sir, this clause, and the act of Congress made in pursuance of it, have been elaborately argued and solemnly adjudicated upon in the highest court in this nation. Our duty in the free States has been made so plain that a child may understand it. I would not refer to this subject, which has been so often discussed on this floor, and repeat what has been so often said, were it not for the unending clamor of the South against us. We are driven to a repetition of the grounds of our defence. We say the slave-hunter may come upon our soil in pursuit of his fugitive, and take him, if he is able, either with our without warrant, and we are not allowed to interfere in the race. "Hands off" is our covenant, and the whole of it. If the owner sees fit to sue out a warrant, he must go before a United States officer with his complaint. It is not the duty of our States magistrates to aid him, the execution of the clause in question depending exclusively upon Federal authority. I think I state fairly the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of Prigg *vs.* the State of Pennsylvania. Now, if Congress alone can provide for the execution of this clause through Federal jurisdiction, and the State magistrates of the North are under no obligations to interfere, is it a violation of the constitutional rights of the South for us to pass laws prohibiting such interference? I would like to have southern gentlemen answer this question; for I insist upon it, that if the Federal Constitution does not *require* them to assist in the recapture of fugitives, it cannot be an aggression upon southern rights to withhold such assistance, and thus maintain the position of neutrality, or non-action, assigned them by the Constitution. Can it be that the northern States have any other duties to perform than those which the Constitution itself imposes? Is Slavery so endeared to us that we must *volunteer* in its support? Sir, in examining this question, the constitutional rights of the South, and the corresponding constitutional obligations of the North, are the only legitimate matters of consideration. No free State has as yet passed any laws discharging fugitives from the service they owe by the laws of other States, or preventing their recapture; and if this is not done, there can be no reasonable ground of complaint against the North. According to the decision alluded to, the fugitive may be recaptured without warrant, and, without any trial of his rights by jury or otherwise, carried into Slavery. This manifestly exposes the colored people of the free States to the southern kidnapper. They have the right, which belongs to all communities, to guard the liberties of their own citizens; and if, for this purpose, some of them have passed laws against the kidnapping of free persons as slaves, and providing a trial by jury to determine the question whether the party claimed is or is not a slave, is it an aggression upon southern rights? When the free colored citizens of the North visit the ports of South Carolina, they are thrown into prison, and sometimes even sold into Slavery. This, if I mistake not, is justified by the South on the ground of a necessary police regulation. Have not the northern States a right to establish *their* police regulations, to secure the rights of *their* citizens? Are not police regulations in behalf of liberty as justifiable as police regulations in behalf of Slavery?

As regards the enticement of slaves from their masters, the number of such cases is small. Neither the States, nor the mass of their citizens, are accountable, or have any connection whatever with such transactions. The great majority of escapes are prompted by other causes than northern interference. The slave has the power of locomotion, and the instinct to be free; and it would indeed be wonderful did he not, of his own will and by his own efforts, struggle for the prize of which he has been robbed. That men will strive to better their condition is a law of nature. The flight of the bondman is a necessary consequence of the oppression under which he groans. Blame not the North [illegible] this but blame your diabolical system, which [illegible] of men. Upbraid nature, for she is always "agitating" the question of Slavery, and persuading its victims to flee. You hold three millions of your fellow-beings as chattels. You shut out from them the light of the Bible, and degrade and brutalize them to the extent of your power, for your system requires it. You trample under foot their marriage contracts, and spread licentiousness over half the States of the Union. You deny them that principle of eternal justice, a fair day's wages for a fair day's work. You sunder their dearest relations, separating at your will husbands and wives, parents and children. And do you suppose the poor slave, smarting under these wrongs will not seek deliverance by flight? And when, through peril and starvation, he finds his way among us, panting for that liberty for which our fathers poured out their blood, do you imagine we shall drop our work and join in the chase with his Christless pursuers? Sir, there is no power on earth that can induce us thus to take sides with the oppressor. Such, I rejoice to believe, is the public sentiment of the North, that I care not what laws Congress may enact, the slavehunter will find himself unaided. The free States will observe faithfully the compromises of the Constitution. They will give up their soil as a hunting ground for the slaveholder, suspending their sovereignty that he may give free chase to his fugitive. They will pass no law to discharge him from the service he may legally owe to the claimant, or to hinder his re-capture. But we *will* not actively co-operate against the unhappy victim of your tyranny. And if Southern gentlemen mean to insist upon such active co-operation on our part, as a condition of their continuing in the Union, they may as well, in my judgment, begin to look about them for some way of getting out of it on the best terms they can. Under no circumstances, I trust, will we yield to their demand.

Another intolerable aggression with which the North is charged is that of scattering incendiary publications in the South, designed to incite insurrections among the slaves. The *southern* gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROSS] has paraded this charge in the most hideous colors. My friend from North Carolina has also been quite graphic in setting it forth, declaring that the free States "keep 'up and foster in their bosoms Abolition societies, 'whose main purpose is to scatter firebrands 'throughout the South, to incite servile insurrec-'tions, and stimulate by licentious pictures our ne-'groes to invade the persons of our white women." Sir, this is a serious accusation, and if true, the South unquestionably has a right to complain. I will not charge the gentleman with fabricating it, but I regret that he did not produce the evidence on which he felt authorized to make it. I deny the charge. I deny that the free States "keep up and foster in their bosom Abolition societies, for that purpose. The Abolition societies, now known as such, belong to what is called the Garrison school—they are voluntary associations of men and women. The Northern States are no more responsible for their doings than the Southern States. Unlike all other parties in the North, they lay down their platform *outside* of the Constitution, and hold that the freedom of the black race can only be accomplished by its overthrow; but they rely upon moral force alone for the triumph of their cause. I deny that they are guilty of inciting, or wishing to incite servile insurrections, or of scattering firebrands among the slaves, or licentious pictures. These Abolitionists are generally the friends of peace, non-resistants, the enemies of violence and blood; and they would regret as much as any people in the Union to see a servile war set on foot by the millions in the land of Slavery. I will add further, while dissenting entirely from their doctrines, that they have among them some of the purest and most gifted men in the nation. But is the charge meant for the Free Soil party of the North? Are they the incendiaries complained of, and their doctrines the firebrands which have been scattered in the South? We hold that Congress should abolish Slavery in this District, prevent its extension beyond its present limits, refuse the admission of any more slave States, and that the Government should relieve itself from all responsibility for the existence or support of Slavery where it has the constitutional power thus to relieve itself, leaving it a State institution, dependent upon State sovereignty exclusively. We are for non-intervention in its true sense. Such is our creed, and we proclaim it North and South. If it is incendiary, then are we guilty, for our newspapers circulate in the slaveholding States. If our faith is a firebrand, we have scattered it, not among your slaves, who are unable to read, but among their owners. Acting within the Constitution, and resolving not to go beyond its granted powers, we mean to avail ourselves of a free press to disseminate our views far and wide. If truth is incendiary, we shall still proclaim it; if our constitutional acts are firebrands, we shall nevertheless do our duty. Sir, this charge has been conceived in the diseased brain of the slaveholder, or the sickly conscience of the doughface. I reiterate my denial that any party in the free States has labored to bring about a war between the two races in the South. I am aware that we have our ultra men among us, nor do I pretend to justify all they have done. They must answer for themselves, and cannot involve the *North* in their responsibility. But there is no party in the free States that harbors any such purpose, or that would not shudder at the contemplation of so merciless and heart-appalling a project.

Passing over the subject of Slavery in this District, which I shall notice in a different connection, I come now to the Wilmot proviso. This would seem to be the sum of all wrongs and outrages—the aggression of aggressions—the monster that, if not at once throttled and destroyed, is to rend the Union asunder. Let us once more look it in the face, take its dimensions, and contemplate its supposed power of mischief. This Wilmot proviso has been much discussed in Congress, and throughout the country; it might be thought, by this time, a stale topic; yet it is far from being an uninteresting one, as the continual discussion of it here evinces. Endeavoring as much as possible to lay aside passion, I would say to southern gentlemen, "Let us reason together." Suppose this alarming measure should pass through both houses of Congress, and receive the Executive sanction, I ask wherein would consist the aggression upon the guarantied rights of the South? Would not every slave State still retain its sovereignty over its peculiar institution? Would not the rights of the master, as sanctioned by local law, remain unimpaired? Look next at the constitutional compromises. The free States bound themselves to allow you to pursue your fugitives upon their soil. Would the adoption of the proviso affect, in the smallest degree, this right? We agreed that you might carry on—or, if you please, that we would join you in carrying on—the slave trade, for twenty years. We faithfully lived up to this compromise; and there is, long since, an end of it. Of course, the proviso can have nothing to do with it. Lastly, it was stipulated that every five of your slaves, for the purposes of taxation and representation, should be counted equal to three of our citizens. Most obviously, the passage of the proviso would not invalidate the rights of the South growing out of this compromise. The old slave States, and those subsequently admitted, would retain all the advantages of the original bargain. Now, I maintain that these subjects of taxation, representation, and the recovery of fugitives are the only matters touching which Congress can constitutionally legislate in favor of Slavery. So far, I admit, our fathers compromised the freedom of the black race, and involved the free States in the political obligation to uphold Slavery. Beyond these express compromises, they did not go, nor design to go. They yielded thus much to the South, under the impelling desire for union, believing that the powers of the Government, with the exceptions expressly made, would be "acttively and perpetually exerted on the side of freedom," and that Slavery would gradually cease to exist in the country. I do not speak of this as matter of conjecture. As early as 1774, Mr. Jefferson declared that "the abolition of domestic Slavery is the greatest object of desire in these colonies;" and the opinion was [illegible] ject could be attained by discontinuing the importation of slaves from abroad. The action of the memorable Congress of this year, and popular movements in all the colonies, about this time, evinced a very decided determination to carry into practice this non-importation policy. This, I presume, will be denied by no one. Our revolutionary struggle commenced soon afterwards; and, basing its justification upon the inalienable rights of man, it could not fail to give an impulse to the spirit of liberty favorable to the abolition of Slavery in the colonies. After the war was over, Mr. Jefferson himself declared that such had been its tendency. Indeed, our fathers could not avoid seeing that Slavery was practically at war with the Declaration of Independence, and their own example in resisting the tyranny of Britain. In 1787 the Federal Constitution was framed, and it is a noteworthy fact, that the word *slave* is not to be found in it. According to Mr. Madison, this word was studiously omitted, to avoid the appearance of a sanction, by the Federal Government, of the idea "that there could be property in man." The circumstance, it seems to me, is very significant. The Constitution is so guardedly framed, that, were Slavery at any moment to cease to exist, scarcely a clause or a word would require to be changed. Who does not see in this that whilst our fathers were framing a Constitution that was to last for ages, the idea stood out palpably before their minds, that the days of Slavery were numbered? Be it remembered, too, that at the time the Constitution was adopted, Slavery had already been abolished, or measures had been taken for its abolition, in seven of the thirteen colonies; and at the very time the Convention which formed the Constitution was in session, maturing its provisions, the Congress of the Confederation was sitting at New York, enacting the celebrated ordinance by which territory enough for five larger States was forever consecrated to freedom. Every inch of soil which the Government then owned was, by this ordinance, made free, and a preponderance secured in favor of the North of twelve non-slaveholding to only six slaveholding States. Thus we see, that at the time the Government was about to enter upon its career, and to exemplify the spirit of its founders, Slavery was a receding power, a decaying interest, a perishing institution. Not chains and stripes, but *freedom* was the dominant idea, the great thought of our fathers. They would have been astounded at the suggestion that Slavery was to be perpetuated in this country as the source of all blessings, and lauded as "the corner-stone of our republican edifice." It was among them, and had been forced upon them by the mother country; and not being able immediately to get rid of it, it was to be *tolerated* and *endured*, till measures could be taken for its final extirpation from the land. And if they regarded it as a curse, and did not expect it to be perpetuated where it then existed, much less they did imagine that it was to be carried into new regions under the sanction of the government of their formation, and become the great central power and all-absorbing interest of the nation. Sir, the thought is monstrous, that the Northern States, when reluctantly agreeing to those compromises by which Slavery received a qualified support in the old States, intended that those compromises should afterwards be indefinitely extended over the American continent. Let it be borne in mind, also, as corroborating the view under consideration, that the founders of our Government had no expectation that the boundaries of the United States, as established by the treaty of 1783, would ever be enlarged. There is not one syllable of evidence, either in the Constitution itself, or the history of its formation, to justify the idea that the acquisition of foreign territory was contemplated. This has been admitted by distinguished southern gentlemen in this Hall, and in the other end of the Capital. Mr. Jefferson seems to have entertained this view; for he questioned the power of the nation to annex foreign territory without an amendment of the Constitution. I deduce from this the obvious and inevitable conclusion, that the Constitution was made *for the United States as then bounded*, and that the compromises on the subject of Slavery, to which the Northern States assented, had reference alone to the Slavery of the *then* slaveholding States; the Slavery that was dwindling and perishing under the weight of its own acknowledged evils; the Slavery that our fathers prevented from spreading into the only territory then belonging to the Government; the Slavery that was almost universally expected, at no very distant day, to be swept from the Republic. The adoption of the Wilmot proviso, therefore, would be in harmony with the Constitution, with the views and expectations of the people at the time of its formation, and with the Declaration of Independence, on which our fathers planted themselves in the struggle against a foreign yoke. It is impossible to escape this conclusion without contradicting the truth of history, and branding the founders of the Government as hypocrites, who, after having paraded the rights of man before the world, and achieved their own freedom, deliberately went to work to found an empire of slaves. And yet southern gentlemen speak of the restriction of Slavery as an *aggression* upon their rights! What makes this charge look still worse is the fact, that the supreme power of legislation by Congress over the territories of the Government has been uniformly exercised from its beginning till the year 1848, and acquiesced in by all its departments. The power in question—that of restricting Slavery—was exercised in 1787; it was exercised in 1820; it was exercised in the passage of the resolutions annexing Texas in 1845, and in its most objectionable form; and it was again exercised in 1848, with the sanction of a slaveholding President. And still we are told that the passage of the proviso would be such an intolerable outrage as to justify the dissolution of the Union!

Mr. Chairman, I have now briefly noticed most of the alledged aggressions of the North. The historical facts I have brought forward bearing upon the question of Slavery restriction, have been often presented; but they cannot be too often repeated, or too carefully remembered, in the present crisis. Sir, it is as true at this day as at any former period of our history, that "a frequent recurrence to former principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty." Turning now to the other side of the picture, I propose to glance at that policy and some of those acts by which Slavery, instead of wearing out its life within its original limits, has been transplanted into new regions, fostered by the Government as a great national interest, and interwoven with the whole fabric of its policy. I shall make no special complaint about "southern aggression," for it will appear, as I have already stated, that the slave power has built itself up by the co-operation or acquiesence of the non-slaveholding States. Nor shall I claim any novelty for the facts I am about to present. They form a part of the the history of the country and the public records of the Government. Through various channels they have found their way to the people; yet it may not be entirely a useless labor to gather them together and endeavor to keep them in remembrance in determining what further concessions shall be made to the demands of Slavery.

At the time the Federal Constitution was adopted, the States of North Carolina and Georgia claimed certain territory, which they afterwards ceded or relinquished to the General Government; and out of this teritory the three States of Tennesse, Alabama, and Mississippi, were formed and successively admitted into the Union. The compromises by which the northern States had bound themselves in reference to Slavery in the old States, were now stretched over these new ones, containing at present a slave population considerably exceeding that of the entire Union at the time of its formation. I have already shown that such an accession of slaveholding States, thus forcing the North into a further partnership with the curses of Slavery, was not contemplated by our fathers. It was accomplished, however, and of course by the aid of northern votes.

In 1803 we gave fifteen millions of dollars for the territory of Louisiana, and the three large Slave States of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri, were subsequently carved out of it, and from time to time admitted into the Union. They contain a slave [illegible] States to support Slavery was enlarged, and the fond expectation of our fathers disappointed.

In 1819 we gave five millions of dollars for the territory of Florida. We did not buy it on account of the value of its lands, or of the added wealth it would bring into the Union, but mainly to strengthen the slaveholding interest. Difficulties were apprehended from the pursuit of fugitives into the territory whilst it continued a Spanish province, and to obviate these difficulties, and at the same time to widen the domain of Slavery, the purchase was made. Florida was subsequently admitted, by the help of northern votes, into full fellowship with Massachusetts and the other free States, whose relations with Slavery were thus again extended, in violation of the faith upon which the Union had been consummated.

In 1845 Texas was annexed, containing territory enough for five or six States. That this was a measure "essentially southern in its character," is placed beyond all doubt by the records of the State Department. It is likewise proved by the declarations of southern members of Congress in 1844, and by the avowals of the southern press and of leading men in the South, from the time the question was first agitated till the project was consummated. No man, it seems to me, can read the history of Texas from its first settlement by emigrants from this country, and for one moment doubt the truth of what I assert. I know it has been said on this floor that the acquisition of Texas was not a southern measure, but a measure of the National Democratic party. I am aware, too, that John Quincy Adams declared in 1845 that it was "in its conception and in its conclusion a Whig measure." With these declarations I have nothing to do. I do not charge any party in the North with favoring annexation with the design of extending Slavery. I speak not as a partisan, but as a seeker of *facts*, bearing upon the alleged charge of northern aggression; and what I assert is, that while the motive of the South in grasping Texas was unmasked, and was in fact glaringly manifest, the North was induced to come to her rescue, and thus added an empire of Slavery to her dominions in the Southwest. Was this a northern aggression? Nine slaveholding States have been added to the Union since the date of its formation, and five of them out of soil then the property of foreign nations. All this has been *generously* done by the free States, for they have had the strength in every instance to prevent these additions and this constantly-augmenting southern power.

The facts I have stated are significant. They show that the northern States, instead of aggressing upon the rights of the South, have aided her in incorporating additional slaveholding States into the Union, whenever such aid has been demanded. But this is not all. Some thirty years ago the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, North Carolina, Arkansas, and Missouri, were more or less incumbered with an Indian population. The white man and his slave were shut out from large regions of those States by the barriers of the red man, which the States themselves had no power to remove. All these regions are now redeemed from the Indian, and actual Slavery extended where it could not go before; and all this has been done by the help of northern votes; for without that help, the laws could not have been passed, nor the treaties have been ratified, by which this great extension of Slavery in so many great States was accomplished.* What a commentary upon the charge of northern aggression!

In 1778 and 1790 the States of Virginia and Maryland ceded to the General Government the territory constituting the District of Columbia, till the late retrocession of the portion ceded by the former. These cessions, under the Constitution, necessarily gave Congress the exclusive power of legislation over the territory ceded, and its inhabitants. Congress accepted these grants, and in 1801 re-enacted the Slave codes of Maryland and Virginia, and thus legalized and *nationalized* Slavery in this District. Slaves are now held here by virtue of this law, and have been so held for nearly half a century. The free States have always had strength enough in Congress to repeal it, but they have forborne to do so. They have done more; they have permitted you to carry on, by their sanction, the Slave traffic here, which is interdicted by your own Slave States. This execrable commerce, which the laws of the civilized world pronounce piracy, punishable with death, and which even the Sultan of Turkey and the Bey of Tunis have put under their ban; this "piratical warfare," as Jefferson called it, and which he declared, three quarters of a century ago, to be "the opprobium of Infidel powers," this heir of all abominations, that existed here for nearly fifty years by *our* permission; here in the heart of this model Republic, around the walls of its Capitol, and under the folds of its flag; here, in the noon of the nineteenth century, and under the full blaze of Christian truth! And northern men have not only upheld this traffic thus far, but their forbearance towards the South inclines some of them to uphold it still longer. I doubt if there are *men* enough in Congress to-day to pass a bill through either House for its abolition. And yet, southern gentlemen talk about the *aggressions* of the North, and threaten to break up the Union to secure their deliverance from our oppression! Will they snap asunder the cords that binds us, in *anticipation* of an act of justice? Suppose Congress should abolish Slavery and the slave trade here; would such abolition interfere in any way with the constitutional rights of the slaveholding States? We in the North are upholding these evils in this District; we are morally and politically responsible for their continuance; and I say to gentlemen from the South, that if by the exercise of an unquestionable power of Congress we rid ourselves of this responsibility, it is our business and not yours. You have no right to complain, and your clamor in this respect about northern aggression ought to be regarded as an insult to the free States.

I pass to another topic. Since the formation of the Government, if I have rightly calculated, about five hundred thousand dollars have been paid by the United States, either directly or indirectly, for fugitive slaves that have taken shelter among the Creek and Seminole Indians. The most of this sum has been paid to the slaveholders of the State of Georgia alone, and directly from the public treasury.

Have the slave States the right thus to call on the General Government and the common fund of the nation to aid them? It has been truly said by an eminent man, himself a slaveholder, that "the existence, continuance, and support of Slavery depend exclusively upon the power and authority of the several States in which it is situated." It was not the intention of our fathers, as I have already stated, that this Government should interfere with Slavery in the States, either to strengthen it or to weaken it. It is their own affair: and if their laws are not strong enough to give it life, it must submit to its doom. When your bondman comes among us in the character of a fugitive, you have the right, guarantied by the express terms of the Constitution, to carry him again into Slavery; but have no right to call upon us to pay our money for slaves escaping into Canada, Mexico, or among the savages and swamps of a Spanish province. Believing Slavery to be a great moral and political evil, we will not go beyond the express letter of our covenant in giving it our support. The Constitution, in the language of Judge McLean, acts upon slaves as persons, and not as property. Congress has uniformly been governed by this principle; and you might as well call upon us to pay for your runaway mules as your slaves. The action of the treaty-making power has been different. A large number of slaves fled from their masters during our last war with Great Britain; and for twenty years did this Government ply its diplomacy in urging the British Government to pay for these fugitives. The sum of one million two hundred and four thousand dollars was at length obtained and paid to southern slaveholders. This open espousal of the cause of Slavery by the Federal Government seems to have been sanctioned by the free States. It was not the work exclusively of southern men. The policy of our fathers was to discourage Slavery, and as far as possible to divorce the Government from it. [illegible] the reversal of this po-[illegible]

Again, in 1831 and 1833, the ships "Comet" and "Encomium," laden with slaves, were wrecked on British soil; and the Federal Government, again hoisting its flag over the peculiar institution, obtained from Great Britain twenty-five thousand pounds for slaves lost by these accidents. Similar losses were incurred by the subsequent fate of the "Enterprise," "Creole," and "Hermosa," and the United States threatened Great Britain with war for refusing to foot these bills of southern slaveholders. An honorable member of this House was virtually expelled from this Hall in 1842 for introducing resolutions denying the constitutional power of the Government to support the coastwise slave trade, and declaring its duty to relieve itself from all action in favor of Slavery. The Senate, not wishing to be out-done by the House, unanimously adopted resolutions declaring it to be the duty of the Government to protect by its flag the rights of American slaveholders in British ports, where by the local law their slaves would otherwise become free. Were these aggressions upon southern rights?

Merely glancing at the unwarranted efforts of the Government, to obtain pay for fugitives to Canada and Mexico, in 1826 and 1828, I proceed to notice a more remarkable example of Federal intervention in favor of Slavery. About twenty-five years ago, when Mexico and Columbia, who had just achieved their independence of Spain, and emancipated their slaves, were threatening to grasp the island of Cuba, our Government distinctly intimated to these young Republics that they must abandon their purpose. And why? Because emancipation in Cuba might otherwise take place, and the contagion spread in the United States. Thus the Federal Government espoussd the cause of Slavery in Cuba, in order at the same time to perpetuate it in our own boasted land of freedom. It did the same thing in 1829. Were these acts northern aggressions? I need scarcely add in this connection, that the main, if not the sole reason why the United States have refused to acknowledge the independence of Hayti, or to hold intercourse with her, is, that the independence of a black Republic might prove dangerous to the perpetuity of American Slavery. Thus the people of the North are deprived of the profits which would arise from established commercial relations between the two Governments, in order that southern Slavery may be sustained.

In 1807, Congress passed a law regulating the coast-wise slave-trade in vessels of over forty tons burden, and describing minutely the manifests, forms of entry at the custom-house, and specifications to be made by the masters of such vessels. The North was thus made responsible for a traffic which is piracy by the law of nations: and such has been our forbearance towards the South, that we have made no effort to relieve ourselves of this responsibility. Take another item of congressional legislation in favor of Slavery, the act of 1793. This act made it the duty of State magistrates to assist in the recapture of fugitives, and for nearly fifty years the slaveholders had the benefit of it, in the prompt interference of the authorities of the North in behalf of their institution. This act, so far as it imposeed duties on State magistrates, was unconstitutional, and has been so decided; but it committed the free States to the support of Slavery, and gave important aid to the South during the whole period named. Nor is this all. Most of the free States re-enacted the substance of this act, as to the duty of State magistrates, and its provisions and penalties respecting the harboring or concealing of fugitives—thus legislating in favor of Slavery, and of course out of a tolerant spirit toward the South. There is no constitutional or moral obligation which required it. It was a bounty, a gratuity, bestowed by the North as a token of sympathy for slaveholders; for the recovery of fugitives, and the penalty for obstructing their recapture, are matters of Federal cognizance entirely, as I have already shown. Yet these enactments now stand unrepealed on the statute books of several of the Northern States. In my own State we have a law punishing, by a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, the harboring of a fugitive slave, as an "offence against the peace and dignity of the State of Indiana." And this law is not a dead letter. Men are indicted and punished under it. Our courts and juries do not hesitate to regard it. Our Legislature, I know, is exceedingly well disposed towards it; for all attempts to repeal our "black laws" (and

(*To be continued.*)

* Benton's late Speech.

DEFECTIVE ORIGINAL COPY

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 4, 1850.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NEW ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

MELODEON, WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, May 29.

SPEECH OF THEODORE PARKER.

MR. PRESIDENT:

If we look hastily at the present aspect of American affairs, there is much to discourage a man who believes in the progress of his race. In this Republic, with the Declaration of Independence for its impartial creed, neither of the great political parties is hostile to the existence of Slavery. That institution has the continual support of both the whig and democratic parties There are now four eminent men in the Senate of the United States, all of them friends of Slavery. Two of these are from the North—both natives of New England; but they surpass their Southern rivals in the zeal with which they defend that institution, and in the concessions which they demand of the friends of justice at the North. These four men are all competitors for the Presidency. Not one of them is the friend of freedom; he that is apparently least its foe, is Mr. Benton, the Senator from Missouri. Mr. Clay, of Kentucky, is less effectually the advocate of Slavery than Mr. Webster, of Massachusetts. Mr. Webster himself has said, 'there is no North,' and to prove it *experimentally*, stands there as one mighty instance of his own rule.

In the Senate of the United States, only Seward and Chase and Hale can be relied on as hostile to Slavery. In the House, there are Root and Giddings, and Wilmot and Mann, and a few others. 'But what are these among so many?'

See 'how it strikes a stranger.' Here is an extract from the letter of a distinguished and learned man, sent out here by the King of Sweden to examine our public schools:—'I have just returned from Washington, where I have been witnessing the singular spectacle of this free and enlightened nation being buried in sorrow, on account of the death of that great advocate of Slavery, Mr. Calhoun. Mr. Webster's speech seems to have made a very strong impression upon the people of the South, as I have heard it repeated almost as a lesson of the catechism by every person I have met within the slave territory. It seems now to be an established belief, that Slavery is not a 'malum necessarium,' still less, an evil difficult to get rid of, but desirable soon to get rid of. No, far from that; it seems to be considered as quite a natural, most happy, and essentially Christian institution'!

Not satisfied with keeping an institution which the more Christian religion of the Mohammedan Bey of Tunis has rejected as a sin against God, we seek to extend it, to perpetuate it, even on soil which the half-civilized Mexicans made clear from its pollutions. The great organs of the party politics of the land are in favor of the extension; the great political men of the land seek to extend it; the leading men in the large mercantile towns of the North—in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia—are also in favor of extending Slavery. All this is plain.

But, sir, as I come up here to this Convention year after year, I find some signs of encouragement. Even in the present state of things, the star of Hope appears, and we may safely and reasonably say, 'Now is our salvation nearer than when we first believed' in Anti-Slavery. Let us look a little at the condition of America at this moment, to see what there is to help or what to hinder us.

First, I will speak of the present crisis in our affairs; then of the political parties amongst us; then of the manner in which this crisis is met; next of the foes of freedom; and last, of its friends. I will speak with all coolness, and try to speak short. By the middle of anniversary week, men get a little heated; I am sure I shall be cool, and think I may also be dull.

There must be Unity of action in a nation, as well as a man 'cannot serve two masters' antagonistic and diametrically opposed to one another, as God and Mammon, no more can a nation serve two opposite principles at the same time.

Now, there are two opposite and conflicting principles recognized in the political action of America: at this moment, they contend for the mastery, each striving to destroy the other.

There is what I call the AMERICAN IDEA. I so name it, because it seems to me to lie at the basis of all our truly original, distinctive and American institutions. It is itself a complex Idea, composed of three subordinate and more simple Ideas, namely;—the Idea that All men have Unalienable Rights; that in respect thereof. All men are created equal; and that Government is to be established and sustained for the purpose of giving every man an opportunity for the enjoyment and development of all those Unalienable Rights. This Idea demands, as the proximate organization thereof, a Government of all the people, by all the people, for all the people; of course, a Government after the principles of eternal justice, the unchanging law of God; for shortness' sake, I will call it the IDEA OF FREEDOM. That is one Idea; and the other is, that One man has a right to hold another man in thraldom, not for the slave's good, but for the master's convenience; not on account of any wrong the slave has done or intended, but solely for the benefit of the master. The Idea is not peculiarly American. For shortness' sake, I will call this the IDEA OF SLAVERY. It demands for its proximate organization, a Government of all the people by a part of the people—the masters; for and by a part of the people—the masters; against a part of the people—the slaves; a Government contrary to the principles of eternal justice, contrary to the unchanging law of God. These two Ideas are hostile, irreconcilably hostile, and can no more be compromised and made to coalesce in the life of this nation, than the worship of the real God and the worship of the imaginary Devil can be combined and made to coalesce in the life of a single man. An attempt has been made to reconcile and unite the two. The Slavery clauses of the Constitution of the United States is one monument of this attempt; the results of this attempt--you see what they are, not order, but confusion.

We cannot have any settled and lasting harmony until one or the other of these Ideas is cast out of the councils of the nations; so there must be war between them before there can be peace. Hitherto, the nation has not been clearly aware of the existence of these two adverse principles; or, if aware of their existence, has thought little of their irreconciliable diversity. At the present time, this fact is brought home to our consciousness with great clearness. On the one hand, the friends of Freedom set forth the Idea of Freedom, clearly and distinctly, demanding liberty for each man.—This has been done as never before. Even in the Senate of the United States it has been done, and repeatedly during the present session of Congress. On the other hand, the enemies of Freedom set forth the Idea of Slavery as this has not been done in other countries for a long time. Slavery has not been so lauded in any legislative body for many a year, as in the American Senate in 1850. Some of the discussions remind one of the spirit which prevailed in the Roman Senate A. D. 62, when about 400 slaves were crucified, because their master, Pedanius Secundus, a man of consular dignity, was found murdered in his bed. I mean to say, the same disregard of the welfare of the slaves, the same willingness to sacrifice them—if not their lives, which are not now in peril, at least their welfare, to the convenience of their masters. Any body can read the story in Tacitus, (Annal. Lib. XIV., cap. 42, *et seq.*) and it is worth reading, and instructive, too, at these times.

Here are some of the statements relative to Slavery in the 31st Congress of the United States. Hearken testimony of the Hon. Mr. Badger, of North Carolina:—'It is clear that this institution [Slavery] not only was not disapproved of, but was expressly recognized, approved, and its continuance sanctioned by the Divine Lawgiver of the Jews.'

'Whether an evil or not, it is not a sin; it is not a violation of the Divine law.'

'What treatment did it receive from the Founder of the Gospel dispensation? It was approved, first negatively, because, in the whole New Testament, there is not to be found one single word, either spoken by the Savior, or by any of the Evangelists or Apostles, in which that institution is either directly or indirectly condemned. And also affirmatively'—this he endeavors to show by quoting the passages from St. Paul usually quoted for that purpose. 'Nothing would be easier than for St. Paul to have said—"Slaves be obedient to your heathen masters; but I say to you, feeling masters, emancipate your slaves; the law of Christ is against that relation, and you are bound, therefore, to set them at liberty." No such word is spoken.'—Thus far goes the Hon. Senator Badger, of North Carolina.

Mr. Brown, of Mississippi, goes further yet. He knows what some men think of Slavery, and tells them 'Very well, think so; but keep your thoughts to yourselves.' He is not content with bidding the 'freest and most enlightened nation in the world' be silent on this matter; he is not content, with Mr. Badger, to declare that if an evil it is not a *sin*, and to find it *upheld* in the Old Testament and *allowed* in the New Testament; he tells us that he 'regards Slavery as a great moral, social, political and religious blessing—a blessing to the slave, and a blessing to the master.'

Thus the issue is fairly made between the two principles. The contradiction is plain. The battle between the two is open, and in sight of the world. But this is not the first time there has been a quarrel between the Idea of Slavery and the Idea of Freedom in America. The quarrel has lasted, with an occasional truce, for more than sixty years. In six battles, Slavery has been victorious over Freedom.

1. In the adoption of the Constitution supporting Slavery.

2. In the acquisition of Louisiana as slave territory.

3. In the acquisition of Florida as slave territory.

4 In making the Missouri Compromise.

5. In the annexation of Texas as a slave State.

6. In the Mexican war—a war mean and wicked, even amongst wars.

Since the Revolution, there have been three instances of great national importances, in which Freedom has overcome Slavery; there have been three victories:

1. In prohibiting Slavery from the Northwest Territory, before the adoption of the Constitution.

2. In prohibiting the slave trade in 1808. I mean, in prohibiting the African slave trade; the American slave trade is still carried on in the capital of the United States.

3. The prohibition of Slavery in Oregon may be regarded as a third victory, though not apparently of so much consequence as the others.

Now comes another battle, and it remains to be decided whether the Idea of Slavery or the Idea of Freedom is to prevail in the territory we have conquered and stolen from Mexico. The present strife is to settle that question. Now, as before, it is a battle between Freedom and Slavery; one on which the material and spiritual welfare of millions of men depends; but now the difference between Freedom and Slavery is more clearly seen than in 1787; the consequences of each are better understood, and the sin of Slavery is felt and acknowledged by a class of persons who had few representatives sixty years ago. It is a much greater triumph for Slavery to prevail now and carry its institutions into New Mexico in 1850, than it was to pass the pro-slavery provisions of the Constitutton in 1787. It will be a greater sin now to extend Slavery, than it was to establish in 1620.

Ever since the adoption of the Constitution, protected by that shield, mastering the energies of the nation, and fighting with that weapon, Slavery has been continually aggressive. The slave-driver has coveted new soil; has claimed it; has had his claim allowed. Louisiana, [illegible] aggression. Now the slave-driver reaches out his hand towards Cuba, trying to clutch that Emerald gem set in the tropic sea. How easy it was to surrender to Great Britain portions of the Oregon territory in a high northern latitude! Had it been south of 36, 30, it would not have been so easy to settle the Oregon question by a Compromise. So when we make a compromise there, 'the reprocity must be all on one side.'

Let us next look at the position of the political parties with respect to the present crisis. There are now four political parties in the land.

1. There is the Government party, represented by the President, and portions of his Cabinet, if not the whole of it. This party does not attempt to meet the question which comes up, but to dodge and avoid it. Shall Freedom or Slavery prevail in the new territory? is the question. The government has no opinion; it will leave the matter to be settled by the people of the territory. This party wishes California to come into the Union without Slavery, for it is her own desire so to come; and does not wish a territorial government to be formed by Congress in New Mexico, but to leave the people there to form a State, excluding or establishing Slavery as they see fit. The motto of this party is inaction, not intervention. King James I. once proposed a question to the Judges of England. They declined to answer it and the King said, 'If ye give no counsel, then why be ye counsellors?' The people of the United States might ask the government, 'If ye give us no leading then, why be ye leaders?' This party is not hostile to Slavery; not opposed to its extension.

2. Then there is the Whig party. This party has one distinctive Idea; the Idea of a Tariff for Protection—whether for the protection of American Labor, or merely American Capital, I will not stop now to inquire. The Whig party is no more opposed to Slavery, or its extension, than the Governmental party itself.

However, there are two divisions of the Whigs, the Whig party South, and the Whig party North. The two agree in their ideas of protection, and their pro-slavery character. But the Whig party South advocates Slavery and Protection--the Whig party North, Protection and Slavery.

In the North, there are many Whigs who are opposed to Slavery, especially to the extention of Slavery; there are also many other persons, not of the Whig party, opposed to the extension of Slavery; therefore in the electioneering campaign, to secure the votes of these persons, it was necessary for the Whig party North to make profession of Anti-Slavery. This was done accordingly, in a general form, and in special an attempt was made to show that the Whig party was opposed to the extension of Slavery.

Hear what Senator Chase says on this point. I read from his speech in the Senate, on March 26, 1850:

"On the Whig side it was urged, that the candidate of the Philadelphia Convention was, if not positively favorable to the Proviso, at least pledged to leave the matter to Congress free from Executive influence, and ready to prove it when enacted by that body.

Gen. Cass had written the celebrated 'Nicholson Letter,' in which he declared that Congress, had no constitutional power to enact the Proviso, But so anxious were the Democrats of the North to assume an Anti-Slavery aspect, (continues Mr. Chase,) that,

'Notwithstanding this letter, many of his friends in the free States persisted in asserting that he would not, if elected, veto the Proviso; many also insisted that he regarded Slavery as excluded from the territories by the Mexican laws still in force; while others maintained that he regarded Slavery as an institution of positive law, and Congress as constitutionally incompetent to enact such law, and that therefore it was impossible for Slavery to get into the territories, whether Mexican law was in force or not.'

This, says Mr. Chase, was the Whig argument:

'Prohibition is essential to the certain exclusion of Slavery from the territories. If the Democratic candidate shall be elected, prohibition is impossible, for the veto will be used; if the Whig candidate shall be elected, prohibition is certain, provided you elect a Congress who will carry out your will. Vote, therefore, for the Whigs.'

Such was the general argument of the Whig party. Let us see what it was in Massachusetts in special. Here I have documentary evidence. This is the statement of the Whig Convention at Worcester, published shortly before the election:

"We understand the Whig party to be committed in favor of the principles contained in the ordinance of 1787, THE PROHIBITION OF SLAVERY IN TERRITORY NOW FREE, and of its abolition wherever it can be constitutionally effected.'

They professed to aim at the same thing which the Free Soil party aimed at, only the work must be done by the old Whig organization. Free Soil cloth must be manufactured, but it must be woven in the old Whig mill, with the old Whig machinery, and by the old Whig weavers. See what the Convention says of the Democratic party:

'We understand the Democratic party to BE PLEDGED TO DECLINE ANY LEGISLATION UPON THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY, with a view either to its prohibition or restriction in places where it does not exist, or to its abolition in any of the territories of the United States.'

There is no ambiguity in that language. Men can talk very plain when they will. Still there were some that doubted; so that the great and famous men of the party came out to convince the doubters that the Whigs were the men to save the country from the disgrace of Slavery.

Here let me introduce the testimony of Mr. Choate. This which follows is from his speech at Salem. He tells us the great work is, '*the passage of a law to-day that California and New Mexico shall remain forever free.* That is . . . an object of *great and transcendant importance*: . . . we should go up to the very limits of the Constitution itself. . . . to defeat the always detested, and forever-to-be detested object of the dark ambition of that candidate of the Baltimore Convention, who has consented to pledge himself in advance, that he will veto the future law of freedom!' 'Is there a Whig upon the floor who doubts that the strength of the Whig party next March will extend freedom to California and New Mexico, if by the Constitution they are entitled to freedom at all? Is there a member of Congress that would not vote for freedom?' [*Sancta simplicitas! Ora pro nobis!*] 'Is there a single Whig constituency, in any free State in this country, that would return any man that would not vote for freedom? Do you believe that Daniel Webster himself could be returned, if there was the least doubt upon this question?'

That is plain speech. But, to pass from the special to the particular, hear Mr. Webster himself. What follows is from his famous speech at Marshfield, Sept. 1, 1848:

'Gen. Cass (he says) will have the Senate; and with the patronage of the government, with the interest that he, as a Northern man, can bring to bear co-operating with every interest that the South can bring to bear, we cry safety before we are out of the woods, if we feel that there is the danger as to these new territories!' 'In my judgment, the interests of the country and the feelings of a vast majority of the people require that a President of these United States shall be elected, who will neither use his official influence to promote, nor who feels any disposition in his heart to promote, the further extension of Slavery in this country, and the further influence of it in the public councils.'

Speaking of the Free Soil party and the Buffalo Platform, he says—'*I hold myself to be as good a Free Soil man as any of the Buffalo Convention.*' Of the Platform he says—'I can stand upon it pretty well.' 'I beg to know *who is to inspire into my breast a more resolute and fixed determination to resist, unyieldingly, the encroachments and advances of the Slave Power in this country, than has inspired it, ever since the day that I first opened my mouth in the councils of the country.*'

If such language as this would not 'deceive the very Elect,' what was most to the point, it was quite enough to deceive the *Electors*. But now this language is forgotten: forgotten in general by the Whig party North; forgotten in special by those who seemed to be the exponents of the Whig party in Massachusetts; forgotten at any rate by the 987 men who signed the letter to Mr. Webster; and in particular it is forgotten by Mr. his own understanding to vote for the extension of the Wilmot proviso over the new territory!

There were some men in New England who did not believe the statements of the Whig party North, in 1840, because they knew *the men* that uttered the sentiments of the Whig party South. The leaders put their thumbs in the eyes of the people, and then said, 'Do you see any dough in our faces?' 'No!' said the people, 'not a speck.' 'Then vote our ticket, and never say we are not hostile to Slavery so long as you live.'

At the South, the Whig party used language somewhat different. Here is a sample from the *New-Orleans Bee*:

'Gen. Taylor is from birth, association, and conviction, identified with the South and her institutions; being one of the most extensive slaveholders in Louisiana—and supported by the slaveholding interest, and *opposed to the Wilmot proviso*, AND IN FAVOR OF SECURING THE PRIVILEGE TO THE OWNERS OF SLAVES TO REMOVE WITH THEM TO NEWLY ACQUIRED TERRITORY.'

3. Then there is the *Democratic party*. The distinctive Idea of the Democrats is represented by the word *Anti-Protection, vs. Revenue Tariff*. This party, as such, is still less opposed to Slavery than the Whigs; however, there are connected with it, at the North, many men who oppose the extension of Slavery. This party is divided into two divisions;—the *Democratic party South*, and the *Democratic party North*. They agree in their Idea of Anti-Protection and Slavery, differing only in the emphasis which they give to the two words. The Democrats of the South say Slavery and Anti-Protection; the Democrats North, Anti-Protection and Slavery. Thus you see, that while there is a specific difference between Democrats and Whigs, there is also a generic agreement in the matter of Slavery. According to the doctrine of elective affinities, both drop what they have a feeble affinity for, and hold on with what their stronger affinity demands. The Whigs and Democrats of the South are united in their attachment to Slavery, not only mechanically, but by a net of *chemical union*.

Mr. Cass's Nicholson letter is well known. He says Congress has no constitutional right to resist Slavery in the territories. Here is the difference between him and Gen. Taylor. Gen. T. does not interfere at all in the matter. If Congress puts Slavery *in*, he says, *very well!* If Congress puts Slavery *out*, he says the same, *very well!* But if Congress puts Slavery *out*, Gen. Cass would say—*No. You shall not put it out.* One has the policy of King Log, the other that of King Serpent. So far as that goes, Log is the better King.

So much for the Democratic Party.

4. The *Free Soil Party* opposes Slavery so far as it is possible to do so, and yet comply with the Constitution of the United States. Its Idea is declared by its words, *No more slave territory*. It does not profess to be an *Anti-Slavery party in general*, only an *Anti-Slavery party subject to the Constitution*. In the present crisis in the Congress of the United States, it seems to me the men who represent this Idea, though not always professing allegiance to the party, have yet done the nation good and substantial service. I refer more particularly to Messrs. Chase, Seward and Hale in the Senate, to Messrs. Root, Giddings and Mann in the House. Those gentlemen swear to keep the Constitution—in what sense and with what limitations, I know not. It is for them to settle that matter with their own consciences. I do know this, that these men have spoken very noble words against Slavery: heroic words in behalf of freedom. It is not to be supposed that the Free Soil party, as such, has attained the same convictions as to the sin of Slavery, which the Anti-Slavery party has long arrived at. Still they may be as faithful to their convictions as any of the men about this platform. If they have less light to walk by, they have less to be accountable for. For my own part,—spite of their short comings, and of some things which to me seem wrong in the late elections in New England,—I cannot help thinking that they have done good as individuals, and as a party: it seems to me they have done good both ways. I will honor all manly opposition to Slavery, whether it come up to my mark, or does not come near it. I will ask every man to be true to *his* conscience, and *his* reason, not to mine.

In speaking of the parties, I ought not to omit to say a word or two respecting some of the most prominent men, and their position in reference to this Slavery question. It is a little curious, that of all the candidates for the Presidency, *Mr. Benton, of Missouri*, should be the least inclined to support the pretensions of the Slave Power. But so it is.

Of Mr. Cass, nothing more need be said at present; his position is defined and well known. But a word must be said of Mr Clay. He comes forward, as usual, with a 'Compromise.' Here it is, in the famous 'Omnibus Bill.' In one point, it is not so good as the Government scheme. Gen Taylor, as the organ of the party, recommends the admission of California, as an independent measure He does not huddle and lump it together with any other matters; and in this respect, his scheme is more favorable to freedom than the other; for Mr. Clay couples the admission of California with other things. But in two points, Mr. Clay's bill has the superiority over the General's scheme.

1. It limits the Western and Northern boundaries of Texas, and so reduces the territory of that State, where Slavery is now established by law. Yet, as I understand it, he takes off from New Mexico about 70,000 square miles—enough to make eight or ten States like Massachusetts, and delivers it over to *Texas to be slave soil*, as Mr. Webster says, out of the power of Congress to redeem from that scourge.

2. It does not maintain that Congress has no power to exclude Slavery in admitting a new State; whereas, if I understand the President, (in his Message—Exec. Doc. H. of R., No. 10, p. 3,) he considers such an act '*an invasion of their rights*.'

Let us pass by Mr. Clay, and come to the other aspirant for the Presidency.

At the Philadelphia Convention, Mr. Webster, at the most, could only get one-half the votes of New England; several of these not given in earnest, but only as a compliment to the great man from the North. Now, finding his Presidential wares not likely to be bought by New England, he takes them to a wider market; with what success we shall one day see.

Something has already been said in the newspapers and elsewhere about Mr. Webster's speech. No speech ever delivered in America has excited such deep and righteous indignation. I know there are influential men in Boston, and in all large towns, who must always have somebody to sustain and applaud. They some time since applauded Mr. Webster, for reasons very well known, and now continue their applause of him. His late speech pleases them; its worst parts please them most. All that is as was to be expected; men like what they must like. But in the country, among the sober men of Massachusetts and New England, who prize right above the political expediency of to-day, I think Mr. Webster's speech is read with indignation. I believe no one political act in America, since the treachery of Benedict Arnold, has excited so much moral indignation as the conduct of Daniel Webster. But I pass by his speech, to speak of other things connected with that famous man. One of the most influential pro-slavery newspapers of Boston calls the gentlemen who signed the letter to him the 'Retainers' of Mr. Webster. The word is well chosen, and quite descriptive. This word is used in a *common*, a *feudal*, and a *legal* sense. In the common sense, it means one who has complete possession of the thing retained; in the feudal sense, it means a dependent or vassal, who is bound to support his liege lord; in the legal sense, it means *the person who hires an attorney to do his business*, and the sum given to secure his services, or prevent him from acting for the opposite party, is called a *retaining-fee*. I take it the word 'Retainers' is used in the legal sense; certainly it is not in the *feudal sense*, for these gentleman do not owe allegiance to Mr. Webster. Nor is it in its common [illegible]

Now, a word about this letter to him Mr. Webster's Retainers—987 in number—tell him—'You have pointed out to a whole people the *path of duty*, have *convinced the understanding and touched the conscience of a nation*.' 'We desire, therefore, to express to you *our entire concurrence in the sentiments of your speech, and our heartfelt thanks* for the inestimable aid it has afforded toward the preservation and perpetuation of the Union.'

They express their *entire concurrence in the sentiments of his speech.* In the speech, as published in the edition 'revised and corrected by himself,' Mr. Webster declares his intention *to support the famous fugitive slave bill, and the amendments thereto*, '*with all its provisions, to the fullest extent*.' When the Retainers express their 'entire concurrence in the sentiments of the speech,' they express their entire concurrence in that intention. There is no ambiguity in the language; they make a universal affirmation—(*affirmatio de omni*.) Now Mr. Webster comes out (by two agents) and recants this declaration. Let me do him no injustice. He shall be heard by his next friend, who wishes to amend the record—a correspondent of the Boston Courier of May 6th:

'The speech now reads thus: "My friend at the head of the Judiciary Committee has a bill on the subject, now before the Senate, with some amendments to it, which I propose to support, with all its provisions, to the fullest extent." Changing the position of the word *which*, and the senttnce would read thus: "My friend at the head of the Judiciary Committee has a bill on the subject, now before the Senate, which, with some amendments to it, I propose to support, with all its provisions, to the fullest extent."'

'Call you that backing your friends?' Really, it is too bad, after his Retainers have expressed their 'entire concurrence in the sentiments of the speech,' to back out, to deny that he entertained one of the sentiments already approved of and concurred in! Can it be possible, we ask, that Mr. Webster can resort to this device to defend himself, leaving his Retainers in the lurch? It does not look like him to do such a thing. But the correspondent of the Courier goes on as follows:

'We are authorized to state, first—That Mr. Webster did not revise this portion of his speech with any view to examine its exact accuracy of phrase; and second—That Mr. Webster, at the time of the delivery of the speech, had in his desk three amendatory sections, . . and one of which provides expressly for the right of trial by jury.'

But who is the person 'authorised to state' such a thing? Professor Stuart informs the public that it 'comes from the hand of a man who might claim a near place to Mr. Webster in respect to talent, integrity and patriotism.'

Still, this recantation is so unlike Mr. Webster, that one would almost doubt the testimony of so great an unknown as is the writer in the Courier. But Mr. Stuart removes all doubt, and says—'I merely add that *Mr. Webster himself has personally assured me that his speech was in accordance with the correction here made*, and that he has now in his desk the amendments to which the corrector refers.' So the Retainers must bear the honor, or the shame, whichsoever it may be, of volunteering the advocacy of that remarkable bill.

When Paul was persecuted for righteousness' sake, how easily might 'the offence of the cross' have been made to cease by a mere transposition! Had he pursued that plan, he need not have been let down from the wall in a basket: he might have had a dinner given him by forty Scribes, at the first hotel in Jerusalem, and a doctor of the law to defend him in a pamphlet.

But, alas! in Mr. Webster's case, admitting the transposition is real, the *transubstantiation* is not thereby affected; the transfer of the *which* does not alter the character of the sentence to the requisite degree. The Bill which he volunteers to advocate contains provisions to this effect: that the owner of a fugitive slave may seize his fugitive, and on the warrant of any 'judge, commissioner, clerk, marshal, postmaster or collecter,' 'residing *or being*' within the State where the seizure is made, the fugitive, without any trial by jury, shall be delivered up to his master, and carried out of the State. Now, this is the Bill which Mr. Webster proposes 'to support, *with all its provisions, to the fullest extent*.' Let him transfer his *which*, it does not *transubstantiate* his statement so that he can consistently introduce a section which 'provides expressly for the right of trial by jury.' This attempt to evade the plain meaning of a plain statement is too small a thing for a great man.

I make no doubt that Mr. Webster had in his desk, at the time alleged, a bill designed to secure the trial by jury to fugitive slaves, prepared as it is set forth. But how do you think it came there, and for what purpose? *Last February, Mr. Webster was intending to make a very different speech*; and then, I make no doubt, it was that this bill was prepared, with the design of introducing it! But I see no reason for supposing that when he made his celebrated speech, he intended to introduce it as an amendment to Mr. Mason's or Butler's Bill. It is said that he will present it to the Senate. Let us wait and see.*

But since the speech at Washington, Mr. Webster has said things at Boston almost as bad. Here they are—extracts from his speech at the Revere House. I quote from the report in the Daily Advertiser: 'Neither you nor I shall see the legislation of the country proceed in the old harmonious way, until the discussions in Congress and out of Congress upon the subject to which you have alluded, [the subject of Slavery,] shall be, in some way, suppressed. Take that truth home with you—and take it as truth.' A very pretty truth that is to take home with us, that 'discussion' must be 'suppressed'!

Again he says:

'Sir the question is, whether Massachusetts will stand to the truth against temptation [that is the question]! whether she will be just against temptation! whether she will defend herself against her own prejudices! She has conquered everything else in her time: she has conquered this ocean which washes her shore; she has conquered her own sterile soil; she has conquered her stern and inflexible climate; she has fought her way to the universal respect of the world; she has conquered every one's prejudices but her own. The question now is, whether she will conquer her own prejudices'!

The trumpet gives no uncertain sound; but before we prepare ourselves for battle, let us see who is the foe. What are the '*prejudices*' Massachusetts is to conquer? The prejudice in favor of the American Idea; the prejudice in favor of what our fathers called 'self-evident truths'; that all men 'are endowed with certain unalienable rights'; that 'all men are created equal,' and that 'to secure these rights governments are instituted amongst men.' These are the prejudices Massachusetts is called on to conquer. There are some men who will do this 'with alacrity'; but will Massachusetts conquer her prejudices in favor of the 'unalienable rights of man'? I think, Mr. President, she will first have to forget two hundred years of history. She must efface Lexington and Bunker Hill from her memory, and tear the old rock of Plymouth out from her bosom. These are prejudices which Massachusetts will not conquer, till the ocean ceases to wash her shore, and granite to harden her hills. Massachusetts has conquered a good many things, as Mr. Webster tells us. I think there are several other things we shall try our hand upon before we conquer our prejudices in favor of the unalienable rights of man.

There is one pleasant thing about this position of Mr. Webster. He is alarmed at the fire which has been kindled in his rear. He finds 'considerable differences of opinion prevail....on the subject of *that speech*,' and is 'grateful to receive....opinions so decidedly concurring with his own,—so he tells the citizens of Newburyport. He feels obliged to do something to escape the obloquy which naturally comes upon him.—So he revises his speech; now supplying an omission, now altering a little; *authorizes* another great man to transpose his relative pronoun and anchor it fast [illegible] another antecedent; appeals to amend[illegible] trial for fugitive slaves; derides his opponents, and compa[illegible] them with the patriots of ancient times. Here is his letter to the citizens of Newburyport—a very remarkable document. It contains some surprising legal doctrines, which I leave others to pass upon. But in it he explains the fugitive slave law of 1793, *which does not 'provide for the trial* of any question whatever *by jury*, in the State in which the arrest is made.—'At that time, nobody regarded any of the provisions of that bill as "repugnant to religion, liberty, the Constitution or humanity;" and *he* has no more objection to the provisions of this law than was seen to them' by the framers of the law itself. If he sees therein nothing 'repugnant to religion, liberty, the Constitution, or humanity,' then why transpose that relative pronoun, and have an amendment 'which provides expressly for the right of trial by jury'?

'In order to allay excitement,' he answers, 'and remove objections.' There are many difficulties, however attending any such provision [of a jury trial]; and a main one, and perhaps the only insuperable one, has been created by the States themselves, by making it a penal offence in their own officers to render any aid in apprehending or securing such fugitives, and absolutely refusing the use of their jails for keeping them in custody till a jury could be empannelled, witnesses summoned, and a regular trial be had.'

Think of that! It is Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio and New York which prohibit the fugitive from getting a trial for his freedom before a jury of twelve good men and true! But Mr. Webster goes on:

'It is not too much to say, that to these State laws is to be attributed the actual and practical denial of trial by jury in these cases.' Generally, the cause is thought to precede the effect, but here is a case in which, according to Mr. Webster, the effect has got the start of the cause by more than fifty years. The fugitive slave law of Congress, which allowed the master to capture the runaway, was passed in 1793; but the State laws he refers to, to which 'is to be attributed the actual and practical denial of trial by jury in these cases,' were not passed till after 1840. 'To what base uses may we come at last'! Mr. Webster would never have made such a defence of his pro-slavery conduct, had he not been afraid of the fire in his rear, and thought his Retainers not able to put it out. He seems to think this fire is set in the name of religion, so, to help us conquer our prejudices, he cautions us against the use of religion, and quotes from the private letter of one of the most distinguished men in England, dated as late as the 29th of January—'Religion is an excellent thing in every matter exept in politicts, there it seems to make men mad.' In this respect, it seems religion is inferior to money, for the Proverbs tells us that money 'answereth all things'; religion, it seems, 'answereth all things' except politics. Poor Mr. Webster! If religion is not good in politics, I suppose irreligion is good there; and really, it is often enough introduced there. So, if religion 'seems to make men mad' in politics, I suppose irreligion makes them sober in politics. But Mr. Webster, fresh from his transposition of his own relative, explains this:—his friend ascribes the evils not to 'true and genuine religion, but to 'that fantastic notion of religion.' So, making the transposition, it would read thus:—'That fantastical notion of religion is an excellent thing in any matter except politics.' Alas! Mr. Webster does not expound his friend's letter, nor his own language, so well as he used to expound the Constitution. But he says, 'The religion of the New Testament is as sure a guide to duty in politics, as in any other concern of life.' So, in the name of 'Conscience and the Constitution,' Prof. Stuart comes forward to defend Mr. Webster 'by the religion of the New Testament; that religion which is formed on the teachings of Jesus and his apostles.' How are the mighty fallen!

Mr. Webster makes a 'great speech,' lending his mighty influence to the support and extension of Slavery, with all its attendant consequences, which paralyze the hand of industry, enfeeble the thinking mind, and brutify the conscience, which should discern between right and wrong; 987 of his Retainers in Boston thank him for reminding them of their duty. But still the fire in his rear is so hot that he must come on to Boston, talk about having discussion suppressed, and ask Massachusetts to conquer her prejudices. That is not enough. He must go up to Andover, and get a minister to defend him, in the name of 'Conscience and the Constitution,' supporting Slavery out of the Old Testament and New Testament. 'To what mean uses may we not descend'!

There is a 'short and easy method' with Prof. Stewart, and all other men who defend Slavery out of the Bible. If the Bible defends Slavery, it is not so much the better for Slavery. If Mr. Stuart and Mr. Webster do not see that, there are plenty of obscurer men that do. Of all the attacks ever made on the Bible by 'deists' and 'infidels,' none would do so much to bring it into disrepute as to show that it sanctioned American Slavery.

It is rather a remarkable fact, that an Orthodox minister should be on Mr. Webster's paper, endorsing for the Christianity of Slavery.

Let me say a word respecting the position of the Representative from Boston. I speak only of his position, not of his personal character. Let him, and all men, have all the benefit of the distinction between personal character and official conduct. Mr. Winthrop is a consistent Whig—a representative of the Idea of the Whig party North, Protection and Slavery. When he first went into Congress, it was distinctly understood that he was not going to meddle with the matter of Slavery—the Tariff was the thing. All this was consistent. It is to be supposed that a Northern Whig will put the mills of the North before the black men of the South: and 'Property before Persons' might safely be writ on the banner of the Whigs, North and South.

Mr. Winthrop seems a little uneasy in his position. Some time ago he complained of a 'nest of vipers' in Boston, who had broken their own teeth in gnawing a file; meaning the 'vipers' in the Free Soil Party, I suppose, whose teeth, however, have a little edge still left on them. He finds it necessary to define his position, and show that he has kept up his communication with the base-line of operations from which he started. This circumstance is a little suspicious.

Unlike Mr. Webster, Mr. Winthrop seems to think religion is a good thing in politics, for in his speech of May 8th he says:—'I acknowledge my allegiance to the whole Constitution of the United States. . . . And whenever I perceive a plain conflict of jurisdiction and authority between the Constitution of my country and the laws of my God, my course is clear, I shall resign my office, whatever it may be, and renounce all connection with public service of any sort.' That is fair and manly. He will not hold a position under the Constitution of the United States which is inconsistent with the Constitution of the Universe. But he says—'There are provisions in the Constitution [of the United States, he means, not of the Universe.] which involve us in painful obligations, and from which some of us would rejoice to be relieved; and this [the restoration of fugitive slaves,] is one of them. But there is none, none, in my judgment, which involves any conscientious or religious difficulty.' So he has no 'conscientious or religious' objection to return a fugitive slave.' He thinks the Constitution of the United States 'avoids the idea that there can be property in man,' but recognizes 'that there may be property in the service or labor of man.' But when it is property in the serv[illegible] man without value received by the ser[illegible], and a claim which continues to attach to a man and his children for ever, it looks very like the idea of property in man. At any rate, there is only a distinction in the words, no difference in the things. To [illegible] the sum of the accidents, all and several of a thing, is practi[illegible] claim the thing.

Mr. Winthrop once voted for the Wilmot Proviso, in its application to the Oregon Territory. Some persons have honored him for it, and even contended that he also was a Free Soiler. He wipes off that calumny by declaring that he attached that Proviso to the Oregon bill for the purpose of defeating the bill itself. 'This Proviso was one of the means upon which I mainly relied for the purpose.' 'There can be little doubt,' he says, 'that this clause had its influence in arresting the bill in the other end of the Capitol,' where it was 'finally lost.' That is his apology for appearing to desire to prevent the extension of Slavery It is worth while to remember this.

Unlike Mr. Webster, he thinks Slavery may go into New Mexico. We may hesitate to admit that Nature has every where [in the new territory] settled the question against Slavery. Still he would not now pass the Proviso to exclude Slavery. 'It would . . . unite the South as one man, and if it did not actually rend the Union asunder, would create an alienation and irritation in that quarter of the country, which would render the Union hardly worth preserving.'

'Is there not ample reason for an abatement of the Northern tone, for a forbearance of Northern urgency upon this subject, without the imputation of tergiversation and treachery?

Here I am reminded of a remarkable sentence in Mr. Webster's speech at Marshfield, in relation to the Northern men who helped annex Texas. Here it is:

'For my part, I think that dough-faces is an epithet not sufficiently reproachful. Now, I think such persons are dough-*faces*, dough-*heads*, and dough-*souls*, that they are all dough; that the coarsest potter may mould them at pleasure to vessels of honor or dishonor, but most readily to vessels of dishonor.'

The Representative from Boston, in the year 1850, has small objection to the extension of slave soil. Hearken to his words:

'I can never put the question of extending slave-soil on the same footing with one of directly increasing Slavery and multiplying slaves. If a positive issue could ever again be made up for our decision, whether human beings, few or many, of whatever race, complexion or condition, should be freshly subjected to a system of hereditary bondage, and be changed from free men into slaves, I can conceive that no bonds of union, no ties of interest, no cords of sympathy, no considerations of past glory, present welfare, or future grandeur, should be suffered to interfere, for an instant, with our resolute and concurring resistance to a measure so iniquitous and abominable. There would be a clear, unquestionable moral element in such an issue, which would admit of no compromise, no concession, no forbearance whatever. . . A million of swords would leap from their scabbards to assert it, and the Union itself would be shivered like a Prince Rupert's dress in the shock.

'But, sir, the question whether the institution of Slavery, as it already exists, shall be permitted to extend itself over a hundred or a hundred thousand more square miles than it now occupies, is a different question. . . It is not, in my judgment, such an issue that conscientious and religious men may not be free to acquiesce in whatever decision may be arrived at by the constituted authorities of the country. . . It is not with a view of cooping up Slavery . . within limits too narrow for its natural growth; . . it is not for the purpose of girding it round with lines of fire, till its sting, like that of the scorpion, shall be turned upon itself, . . that I have ever advocated the principles of the Ordinance of 1787.'

Mr. Mann, I think, is still called a Whig, but no member of the Free Soil party has more readily or more ably stood up against the extension of Slavery. His noble words stand in marvellous contrast to the discourse of the Representative from Boston. Mr. Mann represents the country, and not the 'metropolis.' His speech last February, and his recent letter to his constituents, are too well known, and too justly prized, to require any commendation here. But I cannot fail to make a remark on a passage in the letter. He says, if we allow Mr. Clay's compromise to be accepted, 'were it not for the horrible consequences which it would involve, a roar of laughter, like a *feu de joie*,

*Since the delivery of the above Mr. Webster has introduced his Bill, providing a trial by jury for fugitive slaves. If I understand it, Mr. W. does not offer it as a substitute for a Judiciary Bill on the subject, does not introduce it as an amendment to that or to any thing else. Nay, he does not formally iutroduce it—only lays it before the Senate, with the desire that it may be printed! The effect it is designed to produce is very easy to see. The Retainers can now say—See! Mr. Webster himself wishes to provide a trial by jury for fugitives! Some of the provisions of the Bill are remarkable, but they need not be dwelt on here.

would run down ——— of the ages.' He afterwards says—'Should the South succeed in their present attempt upon the territories, they will impatiently await the retirement of Gen. Taylor from the Executive chair to add the "State of Cuba" . . . to this noble triumph.' One is a little inclined to start such a laugh himself at the idea of the South waiting for that event before they undertake that plan!

Mr. Mann says—'If no moral or religious obligation existed against holding slaves, would not many of those opulent and respectable gentlemen who signed the letter of thanks to Mr. Webster, and hundreds of others, indeed, instead of applying to intelligence offices for domestics, go at once to the auction room, and buy a man or a woman with as little hesitancy or compunction as they now send to Brighton for Beeves?' This remark has drawn on him some censures not at all merited. There are men enough in Boston who have no objection to Slavery. I know such men, who would have been glad if Slavery had been continued here. Are Boston merchants unwilling to take mortgages on plantations and negroes? Do Northern men not acquire negroes by marrying swarthy women at the South, and keep the negroes as slaves? If the truth could be known, I think it would appear that Dr. Palfrey had lost more reputation in Boston than he gained, by emancipating the human beings which fell to his lot. But here is a story which I take from the Boston Republican. It is worth preserving as a monument of the morals of Boston in 1850, and may be worth preserving at the end of the century:

'A year or two since, a bright-looking mulatto youth, about twenty years of age, and whose complexion was not much, if any, darker than that of the great 'Expounder of the Constitution,' entered the counting-room, on some errand for his master, a Kentuckian, who was making a visit here. A merchant on one of our principal wharves, who came in and spoke to him, remarked to the writer that he once owned this 'boy and his mother, and sold them for several hundred dollars.' Upon my expressing astonishment to him that he could thus deal in human flesh, he remarked, that 'when you are among the Romans, you must do as the Romans do.' I know of others of my Northern acquaintances, (and good Whigs too,) who have owned slaves at the South, and who, if public opinion warranted it, would be as likely, I presume, to buy and sell them at the North.'

I have yet to learn that the controlling men of this city have any considerable aversion to domestic Slavery

Mr. Mann's zeal in behalf of freedom, and against the extension of Slavery, has drawn upon him the indignation of Mr. Webster, who is grieved to see him so ignorant of American law. But Mr. Mann is able to do his own fighting.

So much for the political parties and their relation to the matters at issue at this moment. Still there is some reason to hope that the attempt to extend Slavery, made in the face of the world, and supported by such talent, will yet fall; but it will bring only shame on the men who aim to extend and perpetuate so foul a blight. The fact that Mr. Webster's retainers must come to the rescue of their attorney, that himself must write letters to defend himself, and must even obtain the services of a clergyman to help him—this shows the fear that is felt from the Anti-Slavery spirit of the North. Depend upon it, a politician is pretty far gone when he sends for the minister, and he thinks his credit failing when he gets a clergyman on his paper to endorse for the Christian character of American Slavery.

Here I ought to speak of the party not political, who contend against Slavery not only beyond the limits of the Constitution, but within those limits; who are opposed not only to the extension, but to the continuance of Slavery; who declare that they will keep no compromises which conflict with the eternal laws of God—of the Anti-Slavery party. Mr. President, if I were speaking to Whigs, to Democrats, or to Free Soil men, perhaps I might say what I think upon of party, of their conduct, and their motives. But, Sir, I pass it by, with the single remark, that I think the future will find this party where they have always been found. I have before now attempted to point out the faults of this party, and before these men; that work I will not now attempt a second time, and this is not the audience before which I choose to chant its praises.

There are several forces which oppose the Anti-Slavery movement at this day. Here are some of the most important.

The Demagogues of the Parties are all or nearly all against it. By Demagogue I mean the man who undertakes to lead the people for his own advantage, to the harm and loss of the people themselves. All of this class of men, or most of them, now support Slavery —not, as I suppose, because they have any special friendship for it, but because they think it will serve their turn. Some noble men in politics are still friends of the slave.

The Demagogues of the Churches must come next. I am not inclined to attribute so much original power to the churches as some men do. I look on them as indications of public opinion, and not sources thereof—not the wind but only the vane which shows which way it blows. Once the clergy were the masters of the people, and authors of public opinion to a great degree; now they are chiefly the servants of the people, and follow public opinion, and but seldom aspire to lead it, except in matters of their own craft, such as the technicalities of a sect, or the form of a ritual. They may lead public opinion in regard to the 'posture in prayer,' to the 'form of baptism,' and the like. In important matters which concern the welfare of the nation, the clergy have none or very little weight. Still, as representatives of public opinion, we really find most of the clergy, of all denominations, arrayed against the cause of eternal justice. I pass over this matter briefly, because it is hardly necessary for me to give any opinion on the subject. But I am glad to add, that in all denominations here in New England, and perhaps in all the North, there are noble men, who apply the principles of justice to this question of the nation, and bear a manly testimony in the midst of bad examples.—Many of the theological newspapers have shown a hostility to Slavery and an attachment to the cause of liberty which few men expected; which were quite unknown in those quarters before. To do full justice to men in the sects who speak against this great and popular sin of the nation, we ought to remember that it is harder for a minister than for almost any other man to become a reformer. It is very plain that it is not thought to belong to the calling of a minister, especially in a large town, to oppose the actual and popular sins of his time. So when I see a minister yielding to the public opinion which favors unrighteousness, and passing by in silence and 'on the other side,' cases which need and deserve his labors and his prayers,—I remember what he is hired for, and paid for,—to represent the popular form of religion; if that be idolatry, to represent that. But when I see a minister oppose a real sin which is popular, I cannot but feel a great admiration for the man. We have lately seen some examples of this.

Yet on the other side, there are some very sad examples of the opposite. Here comes forward a man of high standing in the New England churches, a man who has done real service in promoting a liberal study of matters connected with religion, and defends Slavery out of what he deems the 'infallible word of God,'—the Old Testament and New Testament. Well, if Christianity supports American Slavery, so much the worse for Christianity, that is all. Perhaps I ought not to say if Christianity supports Slavery. We all know it does not, never did, nor never can. But if Paul was an apologist for Slavery, so much the worse for Paul. If Calvinism or Catholicism support Slavery, so much the worse for them, not so much the better for Slavery? I can easily understand the conduct of the leaders of the New York mob, considering the character of the men, their ignorance, and general position, I can easily suppose they may have thought they were doing right in disturbing the meetings there. Considering the apathy of the public authorities, and the attempt, openly made by some men,—unluckily of influence in that city, —to excite others to violence, I have a good deal of charity for Rynders and his gang. But it is not so easy to excuse the conspicuous ecclesiastical defenders of Slavery. They cannot plead their ignorance. Let them alone, to make the best defence they can.

The Toryism of America is also against us. I call that man a Tory who prefers the accidents of man to the substance of manhood. I mean one who prefers the possessions and property of mankind to man himself, to Reason and to Justice. Of this Toryism we have much in America, much in New England, much in Boston. In this town, I cannot but think the prevailing influence is still a Tory influence. It is this which is the support of the demagogues of the State and the Church.

Toryism exists in all lands. In some there is a good deal of excuse to be made for it. I can understand the Toryism of the Duke of Medina Sidonia, and of such men. If a man has been born to great wealth and power derived from ancestors for many centuries held in admiration, and in awe; if he has been bred to account himself a superior being, and to be treated accordingly, I can easily understand the Toryism of such a man, and find some excuse for it. I can understand the Tory-literature of other nations. The Toryism of the 'London Quarterly,' of 'Blackwood,' is easily accounted for, and forgiven. It is, besides, sometimes adorned with wit, and often set off by much learning. It is respectable Toryism. But the Toryism of men who only know they had a grandfather by inference, not by positive testimony, who inherited nothing but their base limbs; who began their career as tradesmen or mechanics,—mechanics in divinity or law as well as in trade, —and get their bread by any of the useful and honorable callings of life—that such men, getting rich, or lifting their heads out of the obscurity they were once in, should become Tories, in a land too where institutions are founded on the idea of freedom and Equity and Natural Justice—that is another thing. The Toryism of American journals, with little scholarship, with no wit, and wisdom in homœopathic doses, the Toryism of a man who started from nothing the architect of his own fortune, the Toryism of a Republican, of a Yankee, —the Toryism of a Snob—it is Toryism reduced to its lowest denomination, made vulgar and contemptible; it is the little end of the tail of Toryism. Let us loathe the unclean thing in the depth of our soul, but let us pity the poor Tory, for he also, in common with the negro slave is 'a man and a brother.'

Then the Spirit of Trade is often against us. Mr. Mann, in his letter, speaks of the opposition made to Wilberforce by the 'Guinea merchants' of Liverpool in his attempts to put an end to the slave trade. The Corporation of Liverpool spent over £10,000 in defence of a traffic the worst the sun ever shone upon. This would seem to be a reflection upon some of the merchants of Boston. It seems, from a statement in the Atlas, that Mr. Mann did not intend his remarks to apply to Boston, but to New York and Philadelphia, where mass meetings of merchants had been held, to sustain Mr. Clays's compromise resolutions. Although Mr. Mann did not apply his remarks to Boston, I fear they *will* apply here as well as to our sister cities. I have yet to learn that the letter of Mr. Webster's Retainers was any, less well adapted to continue and extend Slavery, than the resolutions passed at New York and Philadelphia, I wish the insinuations of Mr. Mann did not apply here.

One of the signers of the letter to Mr. Webster incautiously betrayed I think, the open secret of the Retainers when he said—'I don't care a damn how many slave States they annex'! This is a *secret*, because not avowed; open, because generally known, or at least believed, to be the sentiment of a strong party in Massachusetts. I am glad, now the issue is joined and we do not fight in the dark, to have it also expressed.

It has long been suspected that some inhabitants of Boston were engaged in the slave trade. Not long since, the brig Lucy Anne, of Boston, was captured on the coast of Africa, with 547 *slaves on board*. This vessel was built at Thomaston in 1830; repaired off Boston in 1848, and now hails from this port. She was commanded by one 'Captain Otis,' and is owned by one 'Salem Charles.' I suppose is a fictitious name, for certainly it would [illegible] respectable [illegible] ton to extend Slavery in this way. Even Mr. Winthrop is opposed to that, and thinks 'a million swords would leap from their scabbards to oppose it.' But it may be that there are men in Boston who do not think it any worse to steal men who were born free and have grown up free in Africa, and make slaves of them, than to steal such as are born free in America, before they are grown up. If we have the Old Testament decidedly sustaining Slavery, and the New Testament never forbidding it; if, as we are often told, neither Jesus nor his early followers ever said a word against Slavery; if scarcely a Christian minister in Boston ever preaches against this national sin; if the Representative for Boston has no religious scruples against returning a fugitive slave, or extending Slavery over 'a hundred or a hundred thousand square miles' of new territory; if the great Senator from Massachusetts refuses to vote for the Wilmot Proviso, or re-affirm an ordinance of Nature, and re-enact the will of God; if he calls on us to return fugitive slaves 'with alacrity,' and demands of Massachusetts that she shall conquer her prejudices; if 987 men in this vicinity, of lawful age, are thankful to him for enlightning them as to their duty, and a Professor of Theology comes forward to sanction American Slavery in the name of religion—why, I think Mr. 'Salem Charles,' with his 'Captain Otis,' may not be the worst man in the world, after all. Let us pity him also, as 'a man and a brother.'

Such is the crisis in our affairs; such the special issue in the great general question between Freedom and Slavery; such the position of parties and of great men in relation to this question; such the foes to Freedom in America. On our side, there are great and powerful allies. The American Idea is with us—the spirit of the majority of men in the North, when they are not blindfolded and muzzled by the demagogues of State and Church. The religion of the land, also, is on our side; the irreligion, the idolatry, the infidelity thereof—all of that is opposed to us. Religion is love of God and love of man—surely, all of that, under any form, Catholic or Quaker, is in favor of the inalienable rights of man. We know that we are right; we are sure to prevail. But in times present and future, as in times past, we need heroism, self-denial, a continual watchfulness, and an industry which never tires. Let us not be deceived about the real question at issue. It is not merely whether we shall return fugitive slaves without trial by jury. We will not return them with trial by jury. Neither 'with alacrity,' nor with the solemnity of judicial proceedings!' It is not merely whether Slavery shall be extended or not. By and by there will be a political party with a wider basis than the Free Soil party, who will declare that the nation must put an end to Slavery in the nation; and if the Constitution of the United States will not allow it, there is another Constitution that will. Then the title, defender and expounder of the Constitution of the United States, will give way to this:—'defender and expounder of the Constitution of the Universe,' and we shall, re-affirm the ordinance of Nature and re-enact the will of God. You may not live to see it, Mr. President, nor I live to see it; but it is written on the iron leaf that it must come—come, too, before long. Then the speech of Mr. Webster, and the defence thereof by Mr. Stuart, the letter of the Retainers, and the letters of the Retained, will be a curiosity; the conduct of the Whigs and Democrats an amazement, and the peculiar institution a proverb amongst all the nations of the earth. In the turmoil of party politics, and of personal controversy, let us not forget continually to move the previous question, whether Freedom or Slavery is to prevail in America. There is no attribute of God which is not on our side; because, in this matter, we are on the side of God.

Mr. President. I began by congratulating you on the favorable signs of the times. One of the most favorable is the determination of the South to use the powers of government to extend Slavery. At this day, we exhibit a fact worse than Christendom has elsewhere to disclose; the fact that one-sixth part of our population are mere property—not men, but things. England has a proletary population the lowest in Europe; we have 3,000,000 proletaries lower than the 'pauper laborers' of England, which the Whig Protectionists hold up to us in terror. The South wishes to increase the number of slaves, to spread this blot, this blight and baneful scourge of civilization over new territory. Hot-headed men of the South declare that unless it is done, they will divide the Union; famous men of the North 'cave in,' and verify their own statements about 'dough-faces' and 'dough-souls.' All this is preaching Anti-Slavery to the thinking men of the North; to the sober men of all parties, who prefer conscience to cotton. The present session of Congress has done much to overturn Slavery. 'Whom the gods destroy, they first make mad.

Domestic Correspondence.

From Our Boston Correspondent.

NO. LXIII.

THE ARGUMENT.—*The Correspondent discourseth of the weather.—He illustrateth and moralizeth.—He giveth himself the lie.—The Sons of Temperance.—The Correspondent declineth preaching, and giveth his opinion as to titles and decorations.—He exhorteth the President.—The colored part of procession—Affliction of the Righteous.—What they did.—The Correspondent sympathizeth and condemneth fanaticism and fanatics.—He berateth Messrs. Garrison and Phillips.—Withdrawal of Mr. White from N. D. S. T.—The Bunker's Hill Celebration.—Why the Correspondent went.—He giveth a variety of opinions ending with open treason.—The Height of Impudence.—Modest Assurance—The burnt children and the fire—Professor Stuart, the Kilkenny Cats and the Bottle Conjuror.—The Quotations.—Morbid eruptive tendency.—Mr. Stuart, Lord Chatham, and Judge Jay.—The Correspondent giveth his opinion.—Stuart's amendments of Virgil and Cicero.—Also of Prud'homme.—A definition disepigrammatized.—&c. &c. &c.*

BOSTON, JUNE 29th, 1850.

The quiet season is coming on and you must expect but little entertainment from this direction, since the New England Convention people have done little but take themselves out of the way as fast as they can. Not, indeed, because the weather has been so hot as to compel a migration to cooler climes, (although we have had a day or two that might serve as a reminder) but because habit has replaced instinct;—even as the Golden Robin when it emigrated from a land of snakes and monkeys to one which furnishes few or none (save in a spiritual and parabolical sense) still continues to suspend its nest from the extremest twigs of trees,—a custom which has provided it with one of the *aliases* by which, though I believe it is a bird of a good general reputation, it is known among men, to wit, that of the Fiery Hang-bird. The weather, this season, has fully vindicated its claim to being a fit provocative of conversation, and of being, if not talkative itself, at least the cause of talk in others. It has furnished the usual amount of *pabulum* for the nourishment of the faultfinding element of human nature. It is fortunate the Dame Nature is so kind a gossip as to furnish her children with endless amusement in criticizing the details of her processes, while she quietly goes on taking care of them none the less, feeding, teaching and playing with them, until at last she puts them, faint and weary, to sleep in her bosom. The season, here, is not a forward one, but, from the very abundance of rain and cool weather which kept it back, it is all the more fresh and beautiful.

But, as John Randolph used to say, in corecting himself, "*I lie*," in saying that there has nothing happened since the New England Convention. In the first place, there was the great meeting of the Sons of Temperance, which made quite a Gala day of the one when it took place. The procession was very long and the effect very picturesque. I shall not depart from my appropriate sphere and interfere with your office of Stated Preaching, by any strictures on the Institution of the Sons. I remember, two or three years ago, arguing from these sort of societies and the *insignia* in [illegible] the folly of our Fathers in excluding [illegible]tions. A *sound*, literally "*vox et præterea nihil*," and a yard of ribbon would buy up multitudes of votes for which solid coin or substantial offices have now to be paid. I remember suggesting this to our present beloved Chief Magistrate, while yet in the course and before he had reached the goal. I hope he will allow me to remind him of the suggestion (for I take it for granted that he is a regular reader of your paper,) that by erecting the Order of St. Zachary, or of the Bloodhound, or what he will, he may make his administration memorable by the introduction of a new element of government. There was one observable feature in this procession, and that was that the colored children walked in their place among the Cadets of Temperance, and, I believe Division or Lodge, or whatever it may be, of Colored Men. You will be sorry to hear that the sensibilities of some of the Southern Sons were wounded by this display. Some of them left the procession and took off their Regalia, and, on being asked the reason why, said, that "other people might walk with those d——d niggers, but *they* would'nt!" The Reporters, too, I understand, were requested not to mention the circumstance of the recognized presence of persons of color, "lest it might injure the Order!"

It is pleasing to know of these refinements of feeling, as it tends to show that those beloved brethren cannot possibly be the hard-hearted and cruel generation some fanatics try to make them out. Two of this latter description, Messrs. Garrison and Wendell Phillips, to wit, were so unfeeling as to exacerbate their wounded sympathies still more by remarks of a pungent character at a meeting held for the benefit of our worthy friend, Edwin Thompson, at which our suffering guests assisted for the purpose of hearing those two disturbers of the public peace It was just after the National Division (I beg pardon of the Sons if I mistake any of their titulary dignities) had made some regulation excluding Colored Men from their Brotherhood of Temperance. Those two impracticable enthusiasts, instead of avoiding the subject or smoothimg it over, as any free-born American naturally would, went directly at it and handled it in the most uncomfortable manner possible. Mr. Phillips first plied the scourge with those flourishes and amenities by which he vainly hopes to make punishment palatable. Then Mr. Garrison followed, and, I am afraid, did not mend matters. It was, if our Southern friends will permit me to borrow a metaphor from their patriarchal customs, like pouring on the rum and red pepper after a nigger has been "moderately corrected." I mourn to hear that their righteous souls were grieved. Like the soldier in the Joe Miller, "strike where you would, there was no pleasing them." Our friend, William A. White, to whom the offensive presence was in some sort due, as Chief Marshal of the day, I am informed, withdrew from the National Division (or whatever it is) after he had vainly resisted this its action.

Then there has been the seventy-fifth anniversary of Bunker's Hill battle, since I wrote to you last. Being old enough to remember the fiftieth Anniversary, which was made doubly interesting by the presence of Lafayette, and the eloquence of Webster, about whom there were no two opinions *then*, I did not propose going over to assist at this one. But when I saw that the Ship-house in the Navy Yard where it w s e held would contain *twelve thousand* spectators, I thought (as I am *not* old enough to have attended any of the entertainments in the Coliseum at Rome) I would not miss seeing such a sight. I went over some hour or two after that appointed for the procession to move, but found that it was not yet launched. It was two or three hours more before it got actually in motion and *moved*. I found no difficulty in getting in, although there was a fearful crush for a short time after I had got in. But there was no occasion for it, as there was room enough for all who wished to be present. The house was tapistried with the flags of all imaginable nations, (unless the Empire of Hayti might have furnished an exception,—but, then, a black empire is *not* imaginable to an American mind,) and with its two galleries filled with ladies, and its floor thronged with men, had really a fine effect. Though I have my private opinion as to the Twelve Thousand. Of the Oration I shall modestly decline to speak, as I heard very little of it. It will not be difficult to imagine its topics. "Our Glorious Selves" must needs have been its burden. The difference in the enthusiasms of the two Celebrations was very apparent The circumstances of the two account for it, in part; but I cannot but think that the history and the discussions of the last quarter of a century have done something towards disenchanting even American vanity of some of its illusions. Whatever the remote results of the American Revolution may be, it is becoming more and more plain to multitudes of minds that, thus far, it might as well never have been fought.

I remember a good many years ago that people used to amuse themselves with various illustrations of the "height of impudence,"—imaginary cases of that quality in its superlative degree. I think, however, that the latest instance is also the very best. I mean the Memorial to the Massachusetts members of Congress to be good enough to vote for the Compromise bill, whatever their "*prejudices*" on the subject may be. That is, the people of Massachusetts having solemnly expressed their wishes on this subject in resolutions passed unanimously by the legislature, a handful of manufacturers, merchants, shopkeepers and others in Boston and elsewhere, beg the Senators and Representatives to be so obliging as to go dead against them! Surely Milesian impudence or Gascon assurance never approached this! I am happy to hear, however, that it has been virtually a failure. Besides the names of some twenty or thirty of the very humblest of the "Retainers" all the others of men of no mark or likelihood. The greatest portion of the Signers of the Webster letter had learned enough wisdom, at least, not to burn their fingers again. They have had also the discretion to say as little as possible about Professor Stuart's Defence of the Defender.

It is remarkable how silently that curious production has been permitted to fall to the ground. They have thought, plainly, that the mantle of silence would best hide this indiscretion of their Father in Israel. Its garrulity and senility, indeed, almost take it out of the province of criticism. It is what Cicero calls (as Mr. Stuart loves a quotation, he shall be indulged) "*Senilis Declamatio.*" The extraordinary manner in which the latter part of his Discourse devours up the first has had no parallel since the days of the Kilkenny cats. He has done what the Bottle Conjurer only promised to do,—jumped down his own throat and swallowed himself so that there is nothing left. Like a worthy son of his patriotic father who "was summoned to the army, but the state of his family obliged him to procure a substitute," he seems to have felt the best of dispositions to fight a good fight for Slavery; but, after calling upon Moses and the Prophets, and Christ and the Apostles for help, he gives in and palms off a very passable imitation of an Anti-Slavery lecture as a substitute! But I shall begin to preach if I do not leave this most tempting text.

Apropos to *quotations*, it is a little singular that with his morbid tendency to an eruption of inverted commas, Mr. Stuart should not be a little more careful in verifying "the scraps which he has stolen from the feast of languages," at which he would fain persuade us he has been. I must advert to two or three, which lie on the very surface. The most extraordinary congeries of blunders is to be found (p. 63) where he points his shaft at Judge Jay by a quotation from Lord Chatham, "when addressing a descendant (then in the *House of Commons*) of a noble ancestor whose picture was in full view." I would humbly inform Mr. Stuart that it is not customary for peers of the realm to address one another *in the House of Commons*, from which Lord Chatham had been removed for nearly ten years at the time of the Speech; and that the Armada Tapestry did not adorn the walls of St. Stephen's Chapel, but of the House of Lords. But what did his lordship say? Mr. Stuart says it was: "From the tapestry which adorns these walls the immortal ancestor *ants!*" Now he said something very different, unless Mr. Stuart has access to authorities shut up to the many. It was this: "From the tapestry that adorns these walls the immortal ancestor of this noble lord frowns with indignation at THE DISGRACE OF HIS COUNTRY!" No doubt illustrious Jay *does* "frown with indignation AT THE DISGRACE OF HIS COUNTRY," but not at anything his son has done or said for the Abolition of Slavery. I have a private opinion of my own that if that uncompromising old great man had known the history, character and purpose of the Society (the American and *Foreign* A. S. Society) over which Mr. Jay was presiding, he *would* have frowned at seeing his son in such company, but I would stake my salvation that the august Shadow only smiled and blessed him for every word he said.

But not content with altering Lord Chatham for the better, Mr. Stuart has also undertaken to improve Virgil and Cicero. On page 22 he thus quotes the former:

Si non cœlum—Acheronta movebo!"

I think if he will turn to the passage, (Æn. vii. 312,) he will find it run, if not as harmoniously, yet more *Maronically*, thus:

"*Flectere si nequeo Superos, Acheronta movebo!*" On page 8 he says, alluding to the worshipful company in which he finds himself, "I will not say with Cicero '*I had rather err with the philosophers than think rightly with the populace,*' &c." Now I do not think that gentleman ever said anything of the sort. He *does* say in the Tusculan Questions (I. 17,) after he has recited what we shall call the *Materialist* doctrines of certain old Philosophers and has come down to Plato and the Pythagorean philosophy, he *does* say, in the person of his interlocutor—"*errare, mehercule, malo cum Platone, quam cum istis vera sentire!*" "I had rather, by Hercules, err with Plato than to perceive the truth with those fellows." And then replies in his own person, in the same vein of pleasant extravagance, "*Ego enim ipse cum edoem ipso non invitus erraverim!*" "And I, too, myself, should have no objection to go wrong with that same man!" Which is a very different thing from what Mr. Stuart puts into his mouth.

And even Prud'homme cannot escape the benumbing influence of Mr. Stuart's leaden mace. His famous definition of property in five words, "*La Propriété c'est un Vol!*" "*Property is Robbery!*" false as it is, is at least pointed and winged, a true epigrammatic shaft that sticks where it strikes. But Mr. Stuart clips off its feathers and blunts its edge by saying that Prud'homme "defines Property as meaning crime." And so on and so forth.—D. Y.

LETTER FROM ABBY KELLY FOSTER.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, June 24, 1850.

MY DEAR FRIEND:

Having to forward a few subscribers for the Standard, I will say a few words, hastily, in relation to the commencement of my summer's work in the West.

I left home a week ago last Saturday, and my husband accompanied me as far as Northampton, Mass., where we had meetings appointed for Saturday evening and all day Sunday Had I time, I would like to write a particular account of these meetings, as they have done more, perhaps, to break into the death-like bigotry and superstition of Northampton than any previously held there. All I have time to say, however, is that the Select-men excluded the meeting from the town hall, and, therefore, it was held in front of the hall, under the shade of the portico and a fine tree immediately in front of the hall. There was a church on either side of the hall, and our large meeting was greatly augmented, at the close of these meetings, by their members. A Sheriff of the place remarked that the Select-men had done more to help us than any thing that we could have done for ourselves. I never addressed a more attentive and respectful meeting in my life. But what gave it its chief value was its preaching to the multitude that passed and repassed. The anti-agitation was never so intense in old Northampton as since these meetings I thank God that, when we have not power to break up the crust of the pro-slavery prejudice and bitterness, he has so framed His laws that His enemies will, in their blindness, do it for us.

My next call Westward was at Syracuse. Here the City Hall was well filled, and I had only to regret that my fatigue and the excessive heat of the evening rendered it impossible for me to speak to that purpose which the occasion demanded.

At the close of the meeting, our old friend, Gerrit Smith—who had been in through the evening—expressed to me his entire confidence in the American Anti-Slavery Society, and, moreover, said that it was, in his opinion, doing more than any other for the abolition of Slavery. He threw $5 into the contribution box, and said he should be happy to aid in the effort to revolutionize Eastern New York; but as, at this time, he was somewhat pressed for funds, and had been obliged to suspend, for the present, the payment of the $50 donations to the poor women of New York, he pledged only $25 to assist in sustaining C. C. Burleigh in the Eastern New York mission. I trust this is an earnest of his again uniting fully with the friends of that Society, and appropriating his munificent donations in a direction which will tell so heavily against Slavery.

There were, at this time, $69, in all, paid in Syracuse to the American Society, and $82 pledged to be paid before November next. This is specially for the renovation of Eastern New York.

I came direct from Syracuse to Cleveland, where I held meetings, yesterday (Sunday), through the day and evening, in the Universalist church The house was crowded with a very attentive audience, and the choir gave us fine singing from the Anti-Slavery Harp. There appeared to be much interest awakened. The next day, we obtained eighteen new subscribers for the Bugle, ten for the Liberator, and those I send enclosed for the Standard The friends paid $12 25 in cash, and pledged $29 50, to be paid in September next, for the Western Anti-Slavery Society.

TWINSBURG, Summit Co., June 27.

I have not had time to finish this hasty letter till this morning. Every moment, out of meeting, is occupied in scattering light, raising funds or obtaining subscribers. We had a meeting in this place through yesterday, in an abandoned Methodist meeting house, which is now owned and used for a store-house, by a man of the world. All the sectarian houses, even the Free-will Baptists', were closed against us, though the latter was built, in part, by Abolitionists for free discussion. But our meeting was well attended, some coming who had never before listened to the wrongs of the slave. The friends here have contributed $15 50, and pledged $2 to the Western Society.

I look forward with great interest to the great conventions which are to commence in this State in August, and to sweep through the State as far as the Committee have funds to carry them. The politicians are now quiet, the prejudices and passions of the people are not aroused, and, therefore, in this the cool of the day, let us approach the reason and conscience of the Nation, and bring them into the service of God and humanity. I was sorrowful as I saw, in Cleveland, so great a field for Anti-Slavery, and then learned how little labor had been bestowed there.

Yours for renewed effort,
ABBY KELLEY FOSTER.

To Correspondents.

S. M. Wednesday will do, but Tuesday would be more certain and convenient.

S. S. F. Shall hear speedily.

A. K. F. Nothing from Mr. H.

General Intelligence.

HIGHLY IMPORTANT FROM NEW MEXICO!

[illegible] CONSTITUTION FORMED.

SLAVERY FOREVER PROHIBITED!

Senators, Representatives, and State Officers to be Elected.

[*By Telegraph to the New York Tribune.*]

ST. LOUIS, Tuesday, June 25.

Advices from Santa Fe to May 25 have been received in this city. The Convention previously called had met and formed a State Constitution, which had been formally promulgated as the Constitution of the State of New Mexico, which was to go into effect on the 1st of July. The Boundary question was deferred. The Constitution prohibits Slavery; Members of the Legislature and Senators, with Representatives to Congress, were soon to be elected.

Second Dispatch.

ST. LOUIS, Tuesday, June 25.

The following has just been received from Santa Fe:

The Convention of delegates called has been held here. They have formed and promulgated a Constitution for the Government of New Mexico.

The Convention assembled on the 15th inst. and the session lasted 8 or 9 days, in which a Constitution was formed, which would go into operation about the first of July.

The boundaries of the State were defined and Slavery prohibited.

The Constitution was adopted on the 25th May. In fifteen days afterward, an election was to take place for the election of Members of the State Legislature.

The Senators and Representatives in Congress would soon be elected, and efforts would also be made to procure them acceptance at Washington.

Mr. St. Vrain, Judge Otero, and Henry Conolly are prominent candidates for Governor, and Captain A. W. Reynolds and Major R. H. Witman for Senators. It is supposed that Hon. Hugh N. Smith, the present Delegate in Congress, would be elected to the House of Representatives.

Additional Confirmations.

Special Dispatch.

JOHN NEVITT STEELE of Maryland, Charge d'Affaires to the Republic of Venezuela.

NICHOLAS A. M'CLUNG, Consul for the port of Acapulco Mexico.

J. C. KRESTCHMAR, Consul at Nassau, New Providence.

EDGAR W. JOHNSON of Washington City, Secretary to the Board of Mexican Indemnity Commissioners.

Homestead exemption laws have been passed in New York, Maine, Ohio, Georgia, Texas, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and California.

SEVERE SENTENCE.—John McNamee, convicted at Charleston of stealing a slave, and also with aiding a slave to escape, has been sentenced to be hung on the 13th September. He has, however, been recommended to Executive clemency—James Cantley, convicted of grand larceny and arson, has been sentenced as follows: To be imprisoned until the 1st day of January next; duringthe interim, to receive in the public market-place, on the first Friday in July, 20 stripes; on the first Friday in August, 20 stripes, and on the first Friday in December, 20 stripes.

☞ ABOLITIONISTS are cautioned respecting a young colored woman named EMILY who has visited Albany, Leominster, Mass and other places, soliciting aid, professing to have been assisted by prominent Abolitionists in different places, *as a Fugitive*. Her stories are untrue, and she is doubtless an impostor.

☞ Editors of the Liberator, Emancipator and Anti Slavery papers will please copy.

THE ONE HUNDRED CONVENTIONS.

GLOUCESTER, (Essex County,)

Sunday, July 7.

[This Convention will be held in the Town Hall, Gloucester Harbor, commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M. Wendell Phillips and Parker Pillsbury are pledged to be present]

PARKVILLE HYDROPATHIC INSTITUTE (near Woodbury, N. J.) having been recently enlarged can now accommodate a few more patients. Applications for admission to be made to Samuel Webb, Secretary, No. 58 South Fourth street, Philadelphia; where the Resident Physician (Joseph A. Weder, M. D. a pupil of Preissnitz, and who has had much experience in Hydropathy both in this country and in Europe) can be consulted on the Fourth day (Wednesday) of every week, between 12 and 1 P. M. 4t.

GREAT AGRICULTURAL WORK!

The Farmer's Guide

TO

SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL AGRICULTURE.

BY HENRY STEPHENS, F. R. S. E.,

Author of the "Book of the Farm," Editor of the "Quarterly Journal of Agriculture," &c., &c., assisted by JOHN E. NORTON, A. M., Professor of Scientific Agriculture in Yale College, New Haven, Author of Agricultural Prize Essays, &c., &c.

THIS highly valuable work will comprise two large royal octavo volumes, containing over 1400 pages, with 18 or 20 splendid steel engravings, and more than 600 engravings on wood, in the highest style of the art, illustrating almost every implement of husbandry now in use by the best farmers, the best methods of ploughing, planting, haying, harvesting, &c., &c., the various domestic animals in their highest perfection; in short, the *pictorial* feature of the book is unique, and will render it of incalculable value to the student of agriculture.

This great work is the joint production of two of the most talented agricultural scholars of the day; the one eminent as an author and editor in Great Britain, and the other as a Professor in Yale College. Both are eminently practical as well as scientific men, and all they say may be relied on as the result of profound research, tested and sustained by practical experiment. The contributions of Professor Norton are chiefly designed to adapt the British portion of the book to this country, and thus to make it an Anglo-American work, giving to its readers all the really useful agricultural knowledge at present attainable in either country.

The work is divided into four departments, distinguished by the four seasons of the year, commencing with Winter, and Professor Norton's notes will be published as an appendix to each part. The first chapter treats of the following subjects, under the head of

INITIATION.

On the best of the existing Methods for acquiring a thorough knowledge of practical Husbandry.
On the Difficulties to be encountered in learning Practical Husbandry, and on the Means of overcoming them.
On the different kinds of Farming.
On the Persons required to Conduct and Execute the Labor of the Farm.
On the Branches of Science most applicable to Agriculture.
On the Institutions of Education best suited to Agricultural Science.
On the Evils attending the neglect of Landowners and others to learn practical Agriculture.
On observing the details and recording the facts of Farming by the Agricultural Student.

TERMS OF THE WORK.—The American edition, the first number of which is already issued, will be published in semi-monthly numbers of 64 pages, with an English steel engraving in each number, of which there will be about 22 in all. Price 25 cents per Number, or $5 in advance for the 22 Numbers.

CLUBBING.

Three Copies will be sent to one address for $12; Four Copies for $15; Five Copies for $18. Cash in all *such* cases to be remitted *direct* to the Publishers, and *not* through Agents.

The work can be sent in Numbers at periodical rates of postage, and mail remittances may be made at the risk of the Publishers.

AGENTS WANTED!

Liberal commissions will be allowed to good canvassing Agents. Booksellers and Periodical Dealers will be supplied on liberal terms.

All orders and communications should be addressed, post paid, to

LEONARD SCOTT & CO., Publishers,
79 Fulton Street, Entrance 54 Gold Street, N. Y.

The Prisoners' Friend.

A NEW VOLUME COMMENCED IN SEPTEMBER.

Charles Spear, Editor and Proprietor.

A NEW VOLUME OF THE PRISONERS' FRIEND, commenced in September. Past experience, large observation, and extensive correspondence, both in the Old and New World have given the subscriber facilities possessed by few persons in this country for conducting such a work. The following will comprise the leading features of the work:

I. Valuable original articles on Criminal Reform.
II. A careful selection from the best foreign periodicals.
III. Reviews of valuable works on different moral topics.
IV. List of New Publications.
V. Public Education.
VI. Moral Tales, illustrating the effects of kindness.
VII. Biographical Sketches of eminent philanthropists.
VIII. A record of the various reforms.

It is also intended to procure ELEGANT ENGRAVINGS. Several valuable writers will contribute to its columns. [illegible] the only paper in the world devoted to the Claims of the Criminal.

II. Its columns are open for Free Discussion.
III. It has no advertising patronage.
IV. It has some of the ablest contributors in this country.
V. It gives a faithful view of the Prison-Reform.

The times now demand a thorough work on the great subjects on which the periodical treats. Such a work having now been started it remains for the friends of the cause to see that it is sustained.

Send your name. If you cannot act, then ask your friend, male or female.

Two dollars a year, in advance. Three copies for $5. Each number to contain 48 pages, making a volume of 576 pages yearly. A title page and index will be added. It will be published in an octavo form, on good paper and fair type. Subscriptions received at the Prisoner's Friend Office, 25 Cornhill, Boston, and at this office.

THE

UNION LITERARY INSTITUTE,

INDIANA.

THIS School is located in a dense settlement of Colored people, on the Eastern verge of Randolph County, Indiana, and near the Western line of Dark County, Ohio.

The Institution was commenced by a donation of 250 Acres of Land, lying together, which were contributed by a few benevolent individuals, in the Spring of 1845. In the Autumn of the same year, a public meeting being called for the purpose, further contributions in money and goods were obtained, amounting, collectively, to $1560—and the Plan of a Free Labor School was adopted; the prominent design of which was, to afford an Education in the higher branches of Learning, to young Colored persons of both sexes, so as to qualify them for Teachers. This measure was intended to supply the defects of the School System, adopted by the laws of Indiana, in which such persons are not allowed to participate.

During the Legislative Session of 1847—8, a Charter from the State was obtained, conferring Collegiate privileges on the Institution.

The concerns of the School are conducted by a Board of thirteen Managers, four of whom are elected annually at a public meeting of the Contributors.

The broad Christian basis upon which this School is founded, and the peculiar characteristics which distinguish it from most of the popular Literary Institutions of the day, will be best understood from Articles 8, 9, and 10 of the Constitution, which are as follows:

Article 8. There never shall be allowed or tolerated in the Union Literary Institution, its government, discipline or privileges, any distinction on account of color, rank or wealth.

Article 9. In all matters relating to ecclesiastics—each person connected with the School, either as teacher or pupil, shall be left to his or her denominational preference; nor shall any teacher be employed, or other instrumentality used to favor one church organization more than another. But the authority of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and the Divinity of the Christian religion, shall be maintained inviolate; and no person known to hold contrary opinions shall be admitted to any official station in the Institution

Article 10. The great principles of the Christian religion, as opposed to war and human Slavery, shall be carefully inculcated in this School.

The School has been kept in session about nine months in each year, commencing with the Spring of 1846. It is under the care of Ebenezer Tucker, of Oberlin College. Professor Tucker is a man eminently qualified to fill the responsible station in which he is placed. His talents, literary attainments and persevering habits, and his devotion to the cause of suffering humanity, all point him out as a man pre-eminently qualified to fill the department of Principal in such an institution.

Since the opening of the School, and preqious to the last Session, 230 Students had received instruction under the care of E. Tucker; some of whom have become qualified to commence the business of Teaching in other settlements.

There is on the premises a Boarding-house, in which the Superintendent and Teacher, with their families, and thirty-six boarders, are accommodated. There is also a log School-house, capable of receiving seventy or eighty pupils.

This School has obtained an excellent character in its own neighborhood, and is acquiring a good reputation abroad. It was visited, not long ago, by the Superintendent of Common Schools, and pronounced by him to be one of the best conducted seminaries which he had visited in the State.

By the regulations of the Institution, the students are required to pay their Tuition fees in cash at the following rates—per session of 22 weeks—viz: First grade, $3,33; second, $4,37; third, $6,50. Their boarding has generally been paid in work, at the rate of four hours in each day.

The Board of Managers are unable to afford instruction to all that apply for it, or to meet the wants of a large and rapidly increasing Colored population. They have therefore appointed the subscriber as their agent, to travel through the Northern and Eastern portions of our country, to solicit assistance from the charitable and benevolent, for the purpose of enabling them to extend their operations, by erecting the needful additional buildings, and supplying them with the proper appendages.

WILLIAM BEARD, Agent.

Duly appointed by the Board of Managers, and recommended by the Governor and other citizens of Indiana.
Fifth month 13th, 1850.

Poetry.

From Graham's Magazine.

DARA.

BY JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

When Persia's sceptre trembled in a hand
Wilted by harem-heats, and all the land
Was hovered over by those vulture ills
That snuff decaying empire from afar,
Then, with a nature balanced as a star,
Dara arose, a shepherd of the hills.

He, who had governed fleecy subjects well,
Made his own village, by the self-same spell,
Secure and peaceful as a guarded fold,
Till, gathering strength by slow and wise degrees,
Under his sway, to neighbor villages
Order returned, and faith and justice old.

Now when it fortuned that a king more wise
Endued the realm with brain and hands and eyes,
He sought on every side men brave and just,
And, having heard the mountain-shepherd's praise,
How he renewed the mould of elder days,
To Dara gave a satrapy in trust.

So Dara shepherded a province wide,
Nor in his viceroy's sceptre took more pride
Than in his crook before; but Envy finds
More soil in cities than on mountains bare,
And the frank sun of spirits clear and rare
Breeds poisonous fogs in low and marish minds.

Soon it was whispered at the royal ear
That, though wise Dara's province, year by year,
Like a great spunge, drew wealth and plenty up,
Yet, when he squeezed it at the king's behest,
Some golden drops, more rich than all the rest,
Went to the filling of his private cup.

For proof, they said that whereso'er he went
A chest, beneath whose weight the camel bent,
Went guarded, and no other eye had seen
What was therein, save only Dara's own,
Yet, when 't was opened, all his tent was known
To glow and lighten with heapt jewels' sheen.

The king set forth for Dara's province straight,
Where, as was fit, outside his city's gate
The viceroy met him with a stately train;
And there, with archers circled, close at hand,
A camel with the chest was seen to stand;
The king grew red, for thus the guilt was plain.

"Open me now," he cried, "yon treasure-chest!"
'T was done, and only a worn shepherd's vest
Was found within; some blushed and hung the head,
Not Dara; open as the sky's blue roof
He stood, and "O, my lord, behold the proof
That I was worthy of my trust!" he said.

"For ruling men, lo! all the charm I had;
My soul, in those coarse vestments ever clad,
Still to the unstained past kept true and leal,
Still on these plains could breathe her mountain air,
And Fortune's heaviest gifts serenely bear,
Which bend men from the truth, and make them reel.

"To govern wisely I had shown small skill
Were I not lord of simple Dara still;
That sceptre kept, I cannot lose my way!"
Strange dew in royal eyes grew round and bright,
And thrilled the trembling lids; before 't was night
Two added provinces blessed Dara's sway.

Miscellany.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF CHEAPNESS.

TEA.

The history of tea, from its first introduction to England, may be read in the history of taxation. It appears to have escaped the notice of nearly all writers on tea that the first tax is a curious illustration of the original mode of its sale. By the act of the 22d and 23d Charles II., 1670-1, a duty of eighteenpence was imposed upon every gallon of chocolate, sherbet, and tea, made and sold, to be paid by the makers thereof.' It is manifest that such a tax was impossible to be collected without constant evasion; and so, after having remained on the Statute Book for seventeen years, it was discovered, in 1688, that 'the collecting of the duty by way of Excise upon the liquors of coffee, chocolate, and tea, is not only very troublesome and unequal upon the retailers of these liquors, but requireth such attendance of officers as makes the neat receipt very inconsiderable.' The excise upon the liquor was therefore repealed, and heavy Customs' duties imposed on the imported tea.

The annals of tea may be divided into epochs. The first is that in which the liquid only was taxed, which tax commenced about ten years after we have any distinct record of the public or private use of tea. In 1660, dear old Pepys writes, 'I did send for a cup of tea (a China drink) of which I never had drank before.' In 1667, the herb had found its way into his own house: 'Home, and there find my wife making of tea; a drink which Mr. Pelling, the Potticary, tells her is good for her cold and defluxions.'

Mrs. Pepys making her first cup of tea is a subject to be painted. How carefully she metes out the grains of the precarious drug, which Mr. Pelling, the Potticary, has sold her at a most enormous price—a crown an ounce at the very least. She has tasted the liquor once before; but then there was sugar in the infusion—a beverage only for the highest. If tea should become fashionable, it will cost in housekeeping as much as their claret. However, Pepys says, the price is coming down; and he produces the handbill of Thomas Garway, in Exchange Alley, which the lady peruses with great satisfaction; for the worthy merchant says, that although 'tea in England hath been sold in the leaf for six pounds, and sometimes for ten pounds the pound weight,' he, 'by continued care and industry in obtaining the best tea,' now 'sells tea for 16s. to 50s. a pound.' Garway not only sells tea in the leaf, but 'many noblemen, physicians, merchants, &c., daily resort to his house to drink the drink thereof.' The coffee-houses soon ran away with the tea-merchant's liquid customers. They sprang up all over London; they became a fashion at the Universities. Coffee and tea came into England as twin-brothers. Like many other foreigners, they received a full share of abuse and persecution from the people and the State. Coffee was denounced as 'hell broth,' and tea as 'poison.' But the coffee-houses became fashionable at once; and for a century were the exclusive resorts of wits and politicians. 'Here,' says a pamphleteer of 1673, 'haberdashers of political small wares meet, and mutually abuse each other and the public, with bottomless stories and headless notions.' Clarendon, in 1666, proposed, either to suppress them, or to employ spies to note down the conversation. In 1670, the liquids sold at the coffee-houses were to be taxed. We can scarcely imagine a state of society in which the excise officer was superintending the preparation of a gallon of tea, and charging his eightpence. The exciseman and the spy were probably united in the same person. During this period we may be quite certain that tea was unknown, as a general article of diet, in the private houses even of the wealthiest. But it was not taxation which then kept it out of use. The drinkers of tea were ridiculed by the wits, and frightened by the physicians. More than all, a new habit had to be acquired. The praise of Boyle was nothing against the ancient influences of ale and claret. It was then a help to excess instead of a preventive. A writer in 1682 says—'I know some that celebrate good Thee for preventing drunkenness, taking it before they go to the tavern, and use it very much also after a debauch.' One of the first attractions of the cup which cheers but not inebriates was as a minister of evil.

The second epoch of tea was that of excessive taxation; which lasted from the five shillings Customs duty of 1688 to 1745, more than half a century, in which fiscal folly and prohibition were almost convertible terms. Yet tea gradually forced its way into domestic use. In a Tatler of 1710 we read 'I am credibly informed, by an antiquary who has searched the registers in which the bills of fare of the court are recorded, that instead of tea and bread and butter, which have prevailed of late years, the maids of honor in Queen Elizabeth's time were allowed three rumps of beef for their breakfast.' Tea for breakfast must have been expensive in 1710. In the original edition of the Tatler, we have many advertisements about tea, one of which we copy:

From the Tatler of October 10, 1710.

"Mr. Fary's 16s. Bohee Tea, not much inferior in goodness to the best Foreign Bohee Tea, is sold by himself only at the Bell in Gracechurch Street. Note,—the best Foreign Bohee is worth 30s. a pound; so that what is sold at 20s. or 21s. must either be faulty Tea, or mixed with a proportionate quantity of damaged Green or Bohee, the worst of which will remain black after infusion."

'Mr. Fary's 16s. Bohee Tea, not much inferior in goodness to the best Foreign Bohee Tea,' was, upon the face of it, an indigenous manufacture. 'The best Foreign Bohee is worth 30s. a pound.' With such Queen Anne refreshed herself at Hampton Court:

'Here thou, great Anna, whom three realms obey,
Dost sometimes counsel take, and sometimes tea.'

When the best tea was at 30s. a pound, the home consumption of tea was about a hundred and forty thousand pounds per annum. A quarter of a century later, in the early tea-drinking days of Dr Johnson, the consumption had quadrupled. And yet tea was then so dear, that Garrick was cross even with his favorite actress for using it too freely. 'I remember,' says Johnson, 'drinking tea with him long ago, when Peg Woffington made it, and he grumbled at her for making it too strong. He had then begun to feel money in his purse, and did not know when he should have enough of it.' In 1745, the last year of the second tea epoch, the consumption was only seven hundred and thirty thousand pounds per annum. Yet even at this period tea was forcing itself into common use. Duncan Forbes, in his Correspondence, which ranges from 1715 to 1748, is bitter against 'the excessive use of tea; which is now become so common, that the meanest families, even of laboring people, particularly in boroughs, make their morning's meal of it, and thereby wholly disuse the ale, which heretofore was their accustomed drink; and the same drug supplies all the laboring women with their afternoon's entertainments, to the exclusion of the twopenny.' The excellent President of the Court of Session had his prejudices; and he was frightened at the notion that tea was driving out beer; and thus, diminishing the use of malt, was to be the ruin of agriculture. Some one gave the Government of the day wiser counsel than that of prohibitory duties, which he desired.

In 1745, the quantity of tea retained for home consumption was 730.729 lbs. In 1746, it amounted to 2.358,589 lbs. The consumption was trebled The duty had been reduced, in 1745, from 4s. per lb. to 1s. per. lb., and 25 per cent. on the gross price. For forty years afterwards, the Legislature contrived to keep the consumption pretty equal with the increase of the population, putting on a little more duty when the demand seemed a little increasing. These were the palmy days of Dr. Johnson's tea triumphs—the days in which he describes himself as 'a hardened and shameless tea drinker, who has for many years diluted his meals with only the infusion of this fascinating plant; whose kettle has scarcely time to cool; who with tea amuses the evenings; with tea solaces the midnights; and with tea welcomes the morning.' This was the third epoch—that of considerable taxation, enhancing the monopoly price of an article, sold to the people at exorbitant profits.

In 1775 the Government boldly repealed the Excise duty; and imposed only a Customs' duty of 12 1-2 per cent. The consumption of tea was doubled in the first year after the change, and quadrupled in the third. The system was too good to last. The concession of three years in which the public might freely use an article of comfort was quite enough for official liberality and wisdom. New duties were imposed in 1787; the consumption was again driven back, and by additional duty upon duty, was kept far behind the increase of the population for another thirty years. In 1784, the annual consumption was only 4,948, 983 lbs.; in 1787, with a reduced duty, it was 17, 047,054 lbs.; in 1807, when we had almost reached the climax of high duties, it was only 19, 239.212 lbs. This state of things, with very slight alteration, continued till the peace. The consumption had been nearly stationary for thirty years with a duty raised from 12 1-2 per cent. to 96 per cent. Those were the days, which some of us may remember, whe we paid 12s. a pound for green tea, and 8s. for black; the days when the convictions for the sale of spurious tea were of constant occurrence; and yet the days when Cobbett was alarmed less tea should become a common beverage, and calculated that between eleven and twelve pounds a year were consumed by a cottager's family in tea-drinking. During this fourth epoch become so rooted in the people that no efforts of the Government could destroy it. The teas under 2s. 6d. a pound (the Company's warehouse prices without duty) were the teas of the working classes—the teas of the cottage and the kitchen. In 1801, such teas paid only an excise of 15 per cent.; in 1803, they paid 60 per cent.; 1806. 90 per cent. And yet the washerwoman looked to her afternoon 'dish of tea' as something that might make her comfortable after her twelve hours' labor; and balancing her saucer on a tripod of three fingers, breathed a joy beyond utterance as she cooled the draught. The factory workman then looked forward to the singing of the kettle, as some compensation for the din of the spindle. Tea had found its way even to the hearth of the agricultural laborer. He 'had lost his rye teeth'—to use his own expression for his preference of wheaten bread—and he would have his ounce of tea as well as the best of his neighbors. Sad stuff the chandler's shop furnished him: no commodity brought hundreds of miles from the interior of China chiefly by human labor; shipped according to the most expensive arrangments; sold under a limited competition at the dearest rate; and taxed as highly as its wholesale cost. The small tea dealers had their manufactured tea. But they had also their smuggled tea. The pound of tea which sold for eight shillings in England, was selling at Hamburg for fourteen pence It was hard indeed if the artizan did not occasionally obtain a cup of good tea at a somewhat lower price than the King and John Company had willed. No dealer could send out six pounds of tea without a permit. Excisemen were issuing permits and examining permits all over the kingdom. But six hundred per cent. profit was too much for the weakness of human nature and the power of the exciseman.

From the peace to the opening of the China tea-trade in 1833, and the repeal of the excise duty in 1834, there was a considerable increase in the consumption of tea, but not an increase at all comparable to the increase since 1834. We consumed ten million pounds more tea in 1833 than in 1816, a period of sixteen years; we consumed in 1848, a period of fifteen years, seventeen million pounds more than in 1833. In 1849 we retained for home consumption 48.735.791 pounds. It is this present period of large consumption which forms the fifth epoch.

The present duty on tea is 2s. 2 1-4d. a pound.—The experienced housewife knows where to buy excellent tea at 4s. a pound. But there are shops in London where tea may be bought at 3s., and 3s. 4d. a pound. Such low priced teas are used more freely than ever by the hard-working poor. The duty is now unvarying, but enormously high. It is unnecessary to assume that the cheap teas are now adulterated teas. In the London Price Currents of the present May, there are several sorts of tea as low as 8d. per pound, wholesale without duty. The finer teas vary from 1s. to 2s. In 1833, previous to the opening of the China trade, the price of Congou tea in the Company's warehouses ranged from 2s. to 3s. per pound; in 1850 the lowest current price was 9d., the highest 1s. 4d. In 1833, the Company's price of Hyson tea varied from 3s. to 5s. 6d.; in 1850, the lowest current price was 1s. 2d., the highest 3s. 4d.

With the amount of duty on tea twice as high in 1850 as in 1833, how is it that tea may be universally bought at one half the price of 1833? How is it that an article which yields five millions of revenue has become so cheap that it is now scarcely a luxury? Before we answer this, let us explain why we say that duty is twice as high now as in 1833.—Before the opening of the China trade tea was taxed under the Excise at an ad-valorem duty of ninety-six per cent on one sort, and one hundred per cent on another, which gave an average of about half-a-crown a pound. Those who resisted the destruction of the Company's monopoly predicted that the supply would fall off under the open trade; that the Chinese would not deal with private merchants; that the market for tea in China was a limited one; that tea would become scarcer and dearer. The Government knew better than this. It repealed the Excise duty with all its cumbrous machinery of permits; and it imposed a Customs' duty *at per pound*, which exists now, as it did in 1836, with the addition of five per cent. Had the duty of 1833 been continued,—the hundred per cent duty—the great bulk of tea, which is sold at an average of a shilling a pound, would have only been taxed a shilling a pound; it is now taxed 2s. 2 1-4d. By a side-wind the Government, with what some persons may call financial foresight, doubled the tax upon the humbler consumers. But it may be fairly questioned whether, if the tax of 1833 had continued, the Government would not have secured as much revenue by the poor doubling their consumption of tea. The demand for no article of general use is so fluctuating as that for tea. In seasons of prosperity, the consumption rises several millions of pounds above the average; in times of depression it falls as much below. Tea is the barometer of the poor man's command of something more than bread. With a tax of 2s. 2 1-4d. a pound, it is clear that if sound commercial principles, improved navigation, wholesale competition, and moderate retail profits, had not found their way into the tea-trade, since the abolition of the monopoly in 1833, the revenue upon tea would have been stationary, instead of having increased a million and a half. All the manifold causes that produce commercial cheapness in general—science, careful employment of capital in profitable exchange, certainty and rapidity of communication, extension of the market—have been especially working to make tea cheap. Tea is more and more becoming a necessary of life to all classes. Tea was denounced first as a poison, and then as an extravagance. Cobbett was furious against it. An Edinburgh Reviewer of 1823, keeps no terms with its use by the poor: 'We venture to assert, that when a laborer fancies himself refreshed with a mess of this stuff sweetened by the coarsest black sugar, and with azure blue milk, it is only the warmth of the water that sooths him for the moment; unless, perhaps, the sweetness may be palatable also It is dangerous even for great reviewers to 'venture to assert.' In a few years after comes Liebig, with his chemical discoveries; and demonstrates that coffee and tea have become necessaries of life to whole nations, by the presence of one and the same substance in both vegetables, which has a peculiar effect upon the animal system; that they were both originally met with amongst nations whose diet is chiefly vegetable; and by contributing to the formation of bile, their peculiar function, have become a substitute for animal food to a lage class of the population whose consumption of meat is very limited, and to another large class who are unable to take regular exercise.

Tea and coffee, then, are more especially essential to the poor. They supply a void which the pinched laborer cannot so readily fill with weak and sour ale; they are substitutes for the country walk to the factory girl, or the seamstress in a garret. They are ministers to temperance; they are home comforts. Mrs. Piozzi making tea for Dr. Johnson till four o'clock in the morning, and listening contentedly to his wondrous talk, is a pleasant anecdote of the first century of tea; the artizan's wife, lingering over the last evening cup, while her husband reads his newspaper or his book, is something higher, which belongs to our own times.—*Household Words.*

GHOST-KNOCKINGS.

The damage to the renting of a house by the knowledge that there have been mysterious noises heard in it, and the unwillingness of most persons to become subjects of public conjecture and curiosity, would prevent the making public of the most of the instances—supposing that spirit knockings were now becoming general and frequent. Chancing ourself to know of three cases, the publicity of which is carefully avoided for these reasons, (and not seeing how or why we should know more of such things than our neighbors,) we feel justified in thinking it probable that the phenomenon—whatever it be—is more common than has been supposed. It is not two ghosts nor twenty, who have the monopoly of it—not two impostors nor twenty, (if imposture it be,) who have hit on the same trick and the same manner of performing it, in different and very distant places. Let it turn out what it will, the topic is one so much discussed, that all which throws light upon it is interesting, and we will 'scoop up' for our readers, the bubble or so that has floated from the general stream into our eddy editorial.

The first story we have to tell is rather to the disparagement of ghosts, and goes to show that the mind may remain pretty much the same, for a while, after death, weaknesses and all. In was narrated in a letter to a private gentleman in this city, by an English friend with whom he is in familiar correspondence. Names cannot be given, for the reasons we specefied in the first sentence of this article, and it was written with no thought of publicity—but the writer is a man of remarkable mind and attainments, and the correspondence is mainly upon topics of religious and moral progress. We briefly give the facts: The wife and children of Mr. W. had been very much disturbed for some months, by unaccountable knockings. An occasional and inexplicable waiving of their bed curtains was another phenomenon which troubled them. They occupied an old house of which Mr. W. had a long lease; but, as he wished to dispose of his lease and move to another part of London, and as he thought these phenomena were tricks that would be explained, he forbade a mention of the circumstances, as likely to prejudice the lease, and they were a family secret accordingly.—Though not a physician, he was a man of considerable medical knowledge, and a female cousin being subject to fits of epilepsy, he had tried experiments of animal magnetism for her cure. These had been partially successful, when on magnetising her, in one of her fits, she changed from a passive state to a look of intelligence.

"What a singular old woman is in the room!" she suddenly exclaimed.

No one being present but Mr. W. and his wife, he questioned the epileptic, getting gradually a description by which they recognized his grandmother, who had been dead several years. He requested her to ask the old lady what she wanted.

"She is most anxious to speak to yourself," was the reply.

Farther parley induced the venerable ghost to open her mind through a second person. She was distressed at the neglect with which her dresses and ornaments were treated, her favorite and valuable things left to mould in out-of-the-way corners, in a way that was insufferable, even where she was.

Having entirely forgotten the existence of these articles, Mr. W. inquired where they were. The old lady at once gave explicit directions where they could be found, and *found they were*, in the very places described, and in the very condition that had vexed the unchanged memory of the departed.—They were attended to, and there were no more supernatural noises for some months.

A recurrence of an attack, while the cousin was on a visit to the house, some time afterwards, brought animal magnetism again into play, and, at the moment of the patient's subjection to the influence a violent knocking was once more heard. The patient did not, this time, become clairvoyant, and no communication was received in any intelligible shape from the unlaid grandmother. The knockings at night were resumed, however, and Mr. W. determined to try if he he could himself get a demonstration, and, in that case, to speak his mind, with the hope that deafness is not among the ills that ex-flesh is heir to. He took a book and kept himself awake till after midnight, and then tried to *will up* the knockings. At two, they suddenly resounded, and he then proceeded to give his grandmother a lecture. He laid before her, in plain terms, the way he was disturbing the family, the risk of damaging his interests, and the better things she ought, for decency's sake, to appear to be thinking about, between this and judgment day. As he went on, the knockings, by their increased rapidity as they broke in, from time to time, expressed displeasure; and at the last allusion and its reproof, there was a perfect storm of rappings. Mr. W. then bade his grandmother good-night, and went to bed—*since which the knockings have been no more heard.*

Droll as this is, it is narrated with perfect sincerity by a strong-minded and highly educated man, and we call on the reader to credit thus much—though he may put what construction he pleases on the circumstances it details for facts. Supposing it true, it would suggest a query reasonable enough, viz: whether those who were wedded most to this life and its trivialities are not those who cling most to it after death, and are not most eager and most likely to stumble on some way to speak to us. Ghosts have continually appeared, to see about property, buried money, and such mere matters of this world, whereas no intelligent ghost (that we ever heard of, at least,) has once put his nose back through the dropped curtain of time and desire, to tell us a single thing that is either useful or agreeable. And yet, that all ghosts, gentle and simple, see things with their new eyes which it would be most interesting for us to know, can scarcely be doubted. Is it possible that none but a "low" ghost would have any communication with us?—The reader will follow out the idea.

To give a second instance:

A gentleman of our acquaintance, who had been a politician for many years, (and of course, had no nerves that anything unsubstantial could much worry,) heard of a farm which could be bought cheap, because "the house was haunted." Feeling simply obliged to the ghosts for the accomodation, he became the proprietor, and moved there with his family for summer quarters. His wife had no objection to the disqualification of the place, for she was a Swedenborgian, and was willing to see any spirit who had an errand to her. They had been there but a short time when the "knockings" commenced. The new tenant was a famous cross-examining lawyer, and would believe nothing on plausibilities. He set all his wits to work to discover how the ghosts did their pounding—for they were the blows of a sledge hammer apparently—and the house being a wooden one, the disturbance to sleep and comfort amounted to a serious nuisance. He was wholly unsuccessful. Three days ago he told the writer of this that it was still a complete mystery. His wife, (to her own belief,) has seen a spirit walk through the locked door of her bed-room, but as it made no communication, they remain in the dark as to its object. The place has no history beyond crops. It has been occupied always by such people as none but very illiterate ghosts could have had any acquaintance with,

One instance more:

A family of young people, whom we know very well, moved into a new three-story brick house, in the upper part of this city, last year. Spirits are supposed to haunt only antiquated dwellings, but, here, they even got the start of rats, cockroaches, and other nuisances, for unaccountable knockings were heard before the comming in of the bill for the first quarter's rent. They sent down to order the servants to stop pounding, on the evening when they first heard it, but the cook was alone and had done nothing of the kind. They lit candles at night, and, again and again, ransacked the house from garret to cellar, to find out what that confounded knocking could be and discovered nothing that would any way explain it. Being young people, full of health and with no unsettled accounts worth a dead man's while to come back about, they are getting gradually indifferent to it, already alluding to the matter with more fun than terror.

It is a point gained, (as a riddance of fright on such subjects,) even if we may reasonably question whether all ghosts are respectable enough to be worthy of notice. If, indeed, (as we suggested in our paper of last week,) a new and intelligent medium of electricity is to be subjected to our service—if spirits who will, now, at command, move tables and shake chairs, are to be put under the control of the living—they are, of course, *inferior to the spirits still in the body.* Is it not a class of the damned who are about being turned to account? Was there not wanted, in the progress of the world, *an intelligent slave*, to play the messenger between our intellects and the clearer perceptions of the spirit world, and has not Providence given us a clue to communication with this new agent, in these electrical knockings which may be the first lessons in an alphabet of spirit language?

Of course there will be much less sinning, when a ghost can be put on the stand for a witness; and indeed, it is in this view, mainly, that we fear it to be a thing for which the world is not quite ready. That spirits are cooly looking on and listening, whatever we do and say, is a fact that has not hitherto been much of an embarassment to us—but, *when they can go and tell!*—virtue becomes inevitable! The pulpit's duty—encouragement to these knockings—is very clear; but will it be popular, on the whole, to know things easier than at present, and will people be willing to see established (what seems very likely,) a system of communication between the other world and this, for a trifling *ghost-age*, as now between cities for a trifling *postage*—news by ghost easy as news by post? It is a subject which, as Bulwer says, "opens up."

[*Home Journal.*

EXTRACT FROM SOUTHEY'S "LIFE OF WESLEY."

The ancestors of John Wesley were highly respectable. His father was a minister of the Church of England, and of great worth and condition; his mother, a woman of extraordinary mind and great piety.

John, the founder of the Methodists, was born at Epworth, on the 17th of June, 1703. Epworth is a market-town in the Lindsay division of Lincolnshire, irregularly built, and containing at that time in its parish about two thousand persons. The inhabitants are chiefly employed in the culture and preparation of hemp and flax, in spinning these articles, and in the manufactory of sacking and bagging. Mr. Wesley's zeal with which he discharged his duty in admonishing them of their sins, excited a spirit of diabolical hatred in those whom it failed to reclaim. Some of these wretches twice attempted to set his house on fire, without success: they succeeded in a third attempt. At midnight some pieces of burning wood fell from the roof upon the bed in which one of the children lay, and burnt her feet. Before she could give the alarm, Mr Wesley was roused by a cry of fire from the street: little imagining that it was in his own house, he opened the door, and found it full of smoke, and that the roof was already burnt through. His wife being ill at the time, slept apart from him, and in a separate room. Bidding her and the two eldest girls rise and shift for their lives, he burst open the nursery door, where the maid was sleeping with five children. She snatched up the youngest, and bade the others follow her; the three elder did so but John, who was then six years old, was not awakened by all this, and in the alarm and confusion he was forgotten. By the time they reached the hall, the flames had spread everywhere around them, and Mr. Wesley then found that the keys of the house door were above stairs. He ran and recovered them, a minute before the stair case took fire. When the door was opened, a strong north-east wind drove in the flames with such violence from the side of the house, that it was impossible to stand against them. Some of the children got through the windows, and others through a little door into the garden. Mrs. Wesley could not reach the garden door, and was not in a condition to climb to the windows: after three times attempting to face the flames, and shrinking as often from their force, she besought Christ to preserve her, if it was His will, from that dreadful death: she then, to use her own expression, *waded* through the fire, and escaped into the street naked as she was, with some slight scorching of the hands and face. At this time John, who had not been remembered till that moment, was heard crying in the nursery. The father ran to the stairs, but they were so nearly consumed, that they could not bear his weight, and being utterly in dispair, he fell upon his knees in the hall, and in agony commended the soul of the child to God. John had been awakened by the light, and thinking it was day, called to the maid to take him up; but as no one answered, he opened the curtains, and saw streaks of fire upon the top of the room. He ran to the door, and finding it impossible to escape that way, climbed upon a chest which stood near the window, and he was then seen from the yard. There was no time for procuring a ladder, but it was happily a low house: one man was hoisted upon the shoulders of another, and could then reach the window, so as to take him out: a moment later and it would have been too late: the whole roof fell in, and had it not fallen inward, they must all have been crushed together. When the child was carried out to the house where his parents were, the father cried out. "Come, neighbors, let us kneel down: let us give thanks to God! He has given me all my eight children: let the house go, I am rich enough." John Wesley remembered this providential deliverance through life with the deepest gratitude. In reference to it he had a house in flames engraved as an emblem under one of his portraits with these words for the motto, "Is not this a brand plucked out of the burning?"

While John was at school, certain disturbances occurred in his father's house, so unaccountable that every person by whom they were witnessed believed them to be supernatural. At the latter end of the year 1715, the maid servant was terrified by hearing at the dining-room door several dismal groans, as of a person at the point of death. The family gave little heed to her story, and endeavored to laugh her out of her fears; but a few nights afterward they began to hear strange knockings, usually three or four at a time, in different parts of the house: every person heard these noises except Mr. Wesley himself, and as, according to vulgar opinion, such sounds were not audible by the individual to whom they foreboded evil, they refrained from telling him, lest he should suppose that it betokened his own death, as they indeed all apprehended. At length, however, the disturbance became so great and so frequent, that few or none of the family durst be alone, and Mrs. Wesley thought it best to inform her husband; for it was not possible that the matter could long be concealed from him; and moreover, as she says, she was minded he should speak to it. The noises were now various as well as strange, loud rumblings above stairs or below, a clatter among a number of bottles, as if they had all at once been dashed to pieces, footsteps as of a man going up and down stairs at all hours of the night, sounds like that of dancing in an empty room, the door of which was locked, gobbling like a turkey cock, but most frequently a knocking about the beds at night, and in different parts of the house.—Mrs. Wesley would at first have persuaded the children and servants that it was occasioned by rats within doors, and mischievous persons without, and her husband had recourse to the same ready solution; or some of his daughters, he supposed, sat up late and made a noise; and a hint that their lovers might have something to do with the mystery made the young ladies heartily hope he might soon be convinced that there was more in the matter than he was disposed to believe. In this they were not disappointed, for on the next night, a little after midnight, he was awakened by nine loud and distinct knocks, which seemed to be in the next room, with a pause at every third strike. He arose and went to see if he could discover the cause, but could perceive nothing; still he thought it might be some person out of doors, and relied upon a stout mastiff to rid them of this nuisance. But the dog, which upon the first disturbance had barked violently, was ever afterwards cowed by it, and seeming more terrified than any of the children, came whining himself to his master and mistress, as if to seek protection in a human presence. And when the man-servant, Robin Brown, took the mastiff at night into his room, to be at once a guard and companion, as soon as the latch began to jar as usual, the dog crept into bed, and barked and howled so as to alarm the house.

The fears of the family for Mr. Wesley's life being removed as soon as he had heard the mysterious noises, they began to apprehend that one of the sons had met with a violent death, and more particularly Samuel the eldest. The father, therefore, one night after several deep groans had been heard, abjured it to speak if it had power, and tell him why it troubled the house; and upon this three distinct knockings were made. He then questioned it if it were Samuel his son, bidding it, if it were, and could not speak, to knock again; but to their great comfort there was no further knocking that night; and when they heard that Samuel and the two boys were safe and well, the visitations of the goblin became rather a matter of curiosity and amusement than of alarm. Emilia gave it the name of old Jeffery, and by this name he was now known as a harmless, though by no means an agreable inmate of the parsonage. Jeffery was not a malicious goblin, but he was easily offended. Before Mrs. Wesley was satisfied that there was something supernatural in the noises, she recollected that one of her neighbors had frightened the rats from his dwelling by blowing a horn there; the horn, therefore, was borrowed, and blown stoutly about the house for half a day, greatly against the judgement of one of the sisters, who maintained that if it was any thing supernatural it would certainly be very angry and more troublesome Her opinion was verified by the event; Jeffery had never til then begun his operations during the day; from that time he came by day as well as by night, and was louder than before. And he never entered Mr. Wesley's study till the owner one day rebuked him sharply, called him a deaf and dumb devil, and bade him cease to disturb the innocent children, and come to him in his study, if he had anything to say. This was a sort of defiance, and Jeffery therefore took him at his word. No other person in the family ever felt the goblin, but Mr. Wesley was thrice pushed by it with considerable force.

So he himself relates, and his evidence is clear and distinct. He says also, that once or twice he spoke to it, he heard two or three feeble squeaks, a little louder than the chirping of a bird, but not like the noise of rats. What is said of an actual appearance is not so well confirmed. Mrs. Wesley thought she saw something run from under the bed, and thought it most like a badger, but she could not well say of what shape; and the man saw something like a white rabit, which came from behind the oven, with its ears flat upon the neck, and its little scut standing straight up. A shadow may possibly explain the first of these appearances; the other may be imputed to that proneness which ignorant persons so commonly evince to exaggerate in all uncommon cases. These circumstances, therefore, though apparently silly in themselves, in no degree invalidate the other parts of the story, which rest on the concurrent testimony of many intelligent witnesses. The door was once violently pushed against Emilia, when no one was on the outside; the latches were frequently lifted up; the windows clattered always before Jeffery entered a room, and whatever iron or brass was there, rung and jarred exceedingly. It was observed also, that the wind commonly rose after any of his noises, and increased with it, and whistled loudly around the house. Mr. Wesley's trencher (for it was before our potteries had pushed their ware into every village throughout the kingdom) danced one day upon the table, to his no small amazement; and the hand of Robin's hand-mill, at another time, was turned round with great swiftness; unluckily Robin had just done grinding; nothing vexed him, he said, but that the mill was empty; if there had been corn in it, Jeffery might have ground his heart out before he would have disturbed him. It was plainly a Jacobite goblin, and seldom suffered Mr. Wesley to pray for the King and the Prince of Wales without disturbing the family prayers. Mr. Wesley was sore upon this subject, and became angry, and therefore repeated the prayer. But when Samuel was informed of this, his remark was, "As to the devil's being an enemy to King George, were I the King myself, I should rather Old Nick should be my enemy than my friend." The children were the only persons who were distressed by those visitations; the manner in which they were affected is remarkable: when the noises began they appeared to be frightened in their sleep, a sweat came over them, and they panted and trembled till the disturbance was so loud as to awaken them. Before it ceased, the family had become quite accustomed to it, and were tired with hearing or speaking of it. "Send me some news," said one of the sisters to her brother Samuel, "for we are secluded from the sight or hearing of any versal thing, except Jeffery."

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

The Queen of Spain has written an autograph letter to the ex-king of the French, earnestly inviting him to try a change of air in Spain, and to choose for his residence Valencia, or any other place of which the climate may be considered beneficial for his health.

——At Coesfeld, the 1050th anniversary of the arrival there of a fragment of the true Cross was celebrated on the 25th ultimo, by a solemn mass, performed by the bishop of the diocese, and attended by all the clergy of the cathedral. The city was visited during the days of the *fete* by 50,000 pilgrims.

——Names.—Emma is from the German, and signifies a nurse; Caroline, from the Latin—noble minded; George, from the Greek—a farmer; Martha, from Hebrew, bitterness; the beautiful and common Mary is Hebrew, and means a drop of salt—a tear; Sophia, from Greek—wisdom; Susan, from Hebrew—a lily; Thomas, from Hebrew—a twin; Robert, from German—famous in council.

——The *Stamford Mercury* states that the following inscription is on the tomb of a Quaker, buried in an orchard at Thorpe by Water, near Uppingham:—Headstone: "Here lies the body of John Osborn, a servant of Jesus Christ, aged 84 years: he deceased in the 7th Month, 1668, at Oakham Prison, where he was unlawfully imprisoned and unjustly detained for denying maintenance to a false minister for the parochial claim of tithes."

——At a miserably-attended meeting of the Repeal Association on Monday, (says the *London Weekly News*,) the rent for the week was announced to be £4. 19s. 8d. Mr. John O'Connell took occasion to remark that the rent on that day six years (10th of June, 1844) was £3,339, 18s. 4d.: he then stated that if some "demonstration of popular support is not made in our favor, we must advertise the hall for sale."

——The writer in the *New York Nation* who attempts from week to week to practice on the credulity of his readers by astounding revelations of the despotism and cruelty of England, tells us in a late number, that "no female servant in England is allowed to wear a *veil*, or use a *parasol*." Poor creatures! why did he not say that the gaols were crowded with pretty nursemaids who have been found guilty of violating the iniquitous enactment, and that thousands are arrested every Sunday by the "vile myrmidons" of the law?—*London Weekly News.*

——Singular Bequest.——Some few years ago, Mrs. Salter, the widow of a wealthy brewer at Rickmansworth, Herts, provided in her will that a hogshead of ale should be daily given away by the possessors of the brewery for ever. Accordingly every morning the barrel is placed on the public road, with an iron ladle by its side, when such of her majesty's lieges as are not above quaffing a ladlefull of stingo in that public manner may be seen wetting the day or washing down their eleven o'clock. Formerly a brass tap was put with the barrel; but as that frequently disappeared with the ale, the more primitive method was substituted of a spike hole.—*Sussex Express.*

——Exhumation of a Body Ominous to Family of the Deceased.—In the counties of Leicester and Northampton, and I doubt not in other parts of England, there is a superstitious idea that the removal or or exhumation of a body after interment bodes death or some terrible calamity to the surviving members of the deceased's family. Turner, in his "History of Remarkable Providences, Lond., 1677, p. 77, thus alludes to this superstition:—"Thomas Fludd, of Kent, Esq., told me that it is an old observation which was pressed earnestly to King James I. that he should not remove the Queen of Scots' body from Northamptonshire, where she was beheaded and interred. For that it always bodes ill to the family when bodies are removed from their graves. For some of the family will die shortly after, as did Prince Henry, and I think, Queen Anne."—*Notes and Queries.*

——Visit of M. Thiers.—The Paris correspondents or the daily papers state that M. Thiers left Paris for Claremont on Tuesday. The correspondent of the *Times*, who is doubtless well informed, says, "It is believed that the journey is connected with the so much talked of reconciliation of the elder and younger branches of the Bourbon family. The unwillingness of the Duchess of Orleans to put in peril the prospects of her son has hitherto been the most serious obstacle to that reconciliation; but it is believed that the influence of M. Thiers will do much in removing her scruples on that head. M. Thiers had abandoned his intention of visiting London, at least for the present; but it is said here that a change for the worse in the health of the King must have been the cause of his so suddenly resuming his original intention." M. Thiers paid a visit to the President of the Republic immediately previous to setting out. It is stated that M. Guizot also purposes "paying a visit to London." Shortly after the House of Lords had met on Thursday night, M. Thiers entered, accompanied by Sir Edward Ellis. He seemed to be in high health and spirits, and maintained an animated conversation with several Peers and Commoners who joined him. Lord Palmerston, who appeared to have been apprised of the presence of the French statesman, entered hastily, and, after a cordial greeting on both sides, they remained in lively conversation for some minutes. Presently Lord Brougham made his way down to the Throne, and after him the Marquis of Landsdown, both of whom shook hands with M. Thiers with the utmost apparent heartiness.

——"Some time since," says the *Illustrated News*, "there appeared in the public journals a statement to the effect that a certain young lady, under age, was to be placed in a convent, by her father, if she did not procure, before the 30th of April last, one million of used postage stamps. This caused numerous persons to forward stamps for the purpose of securing her liberty. In March last, a lady, a member of one of the first families in Derbyshire, residing not many miles from Derby, mentioned the conditions to her friends, and in a short time the lady began to receive packages by post and railway from every quarter, which poured in in such numbers, that, in ten days during last April, she received parcels containing millions of stamps. The walking postman, who was in the habit of delivering a few letters daily at the mansion where the lady resides, became so loaded with letters and packages containing Queen's heads, that it was necessary to employ another man to assist him. On one morning between ninety and one hundred letters and packages arrived by post, and on another between one hundred and twenty and one hundred and thirty. Those were in addition to multitudes which arrived on other days. Boxes, bales, and packages also poured in by railway; and to such an extent that it became necessary to give public notice, by advertisements and printed circulars, that it was urgently desired no more stamps should be sent, as the young lady had procured the number she desired. Composing this extraordinary accumulation is a large wine hamper full, a large wine cooler, a large clothes basket. A packet from a great mercantile house in London contains 240,000 Queen's heads.—There is also a tea-chest full sent from another quarter. There were nine boxes between one and two feet long, a foot wide, and from four to ten inches deep; seven packages between one and two feet long, and a foot wide, and about six inches deep. Smaller packets formed a heap two feet six inches long, one foot wide, and one foot six inches deep; and two baskets two feet long, one foot six inches wide, and one foot four inches deep were filled; besides which, many boxes full were received, but sent back to the railway station. In addition to this accumulation, letters from all quarters arrived, many from persons of the highest rank, expressing the deepest sympathy and the most kindly feeling Numbers of them stated that large collections of heads would still be sent if required"

——Mr. Carlyle's Article on the West Indies.—Mr. Carlyle's notorious article in "Fraser's Magazine" on West Indian Slavery, (says the London Inquirer) has excited comment from almost every colonial newspaper. In most instances the article on the subject that appeared in the Inquirer has been given also The *Colombo Observer* of March 14th says:—It is well that the honest, high minded men of England, especially those who value the Bible above Sartor Resartus, who value the eternal principles of justice more than they worship heroes, are not likely to be carried away, but on the contrary deeply disgusted with such traitorous and wicked sophistries as the mock Philosopher indulges in. He has been and will be severely castigated As a specimen, we refer to an Article that heads our European Extracts. It is from the organ of the English Unitarians, a body that have claimed, and with some show of justice, Mr. Carlyle as one of them. The writer is not therefore likely to be prejudiced against Carlyle—but, like every honest, true hearted friend of freedom, he abhors his new philosophy, and we reprint the Inquirer's vehement protest, both on account of our concurrence in its sentiments, and to prevent Carlyle being over-valued by our young readers. He is, with all his uncouthness, a most fascinating writer, and likely, therefore, to be the more dangerous when he advocates heterodoxy in politics or ethics."

——The Laureateship.—The *Times* of this morning contains the following letter from Mr. Douglas Jerrold:

"Sir,—As yet no one has been appointed to the Laureateship; and the belief is strengthening that the function of Court poet has ceased to be—a memory of the past with the office of the Court jester. Shakespeare's house has been purchased for the nation by certain of the people; and there was a very confident hope expressed by the committee for such purchase—a hope suffered to be entertained by a member of the Cabinet—that a provision would be made for the endowment of a wardership of the birth place of the poet. May I be permitted to suggest, in the event of the determination of the place of the Laureate, that the salary that would otherwise cease with it should endow the post of keepership of the house at Stratford-upon Avon? If the Court bays—with the Court cap-and-bells—are to be cast aside, at least let the salary that recommended the laurel reward a worthier office—that of *custos* of the hearth of the world's teacher. "Warden of the house of Shakespeare, *vice* post of Poet Laureate abolished—would, I am bold to think, be a no less grateful than graceful announcement, if officially set forth to the people of England. I have the honor to be, &c."

——Kidnapping in the United States.—The following letter has been addressed to the editor of the *Morning Chronicle*:

Sir,—I enclose an extract from a letter received yesterday from a near relative, in the earnest hope that you may think it worthy of insertion in your columns. No Englishman will, I trust, be able to read the story without thankfulness to the Great Ruler of the world that British liberty is not American liberty. The monstrous transaction occurred, let it be remembered, in the "Queen City of the West"—in the market-place, and at noon-day! Yet not one hand, save that of an Englishman, was lifted to prevent the foul outrage. Surely, sir, if such things may be done in open day, in a "free State," we may fairly conclude that the boastful republicans of the West neither knew what freedom really is, nor hesitate to give the lie to the fundamental principle of their vaunted constitution—"*All* men are born *free* and equal."—Enclosing my name and address, I am, sir, yours respectfully,

An Englishman.

Bristol, June 5.

EXTRACT FROM A LETTER DATED CINCINNATI, MAY 15, 1850.

I have seen for the first time in my life what I never expected to see in one of the free States—a human being kidnapped and carried off by four monsters, armed with pistols, bowie knives, and a club. Yes! at noonday, on the 11th, in the market place, in the centre of this large, busy, and populous city! As I was going to dinner I saw two men dragging along a fine, genteelly dressed young negro, who was shouting "Murder!" as loud as he could, and resisting with all his might, but vainly, being in the grasp of powerful, muscular, determined wretches. I rushed forward and seized one of them by the arm, to ask them to go to the mayor's office, hoping to get some chance for the young man there. In the struggle the man I had hold of seemed neither to see nor hear me, but the poor negro did, and seized so fast hold of my coat, I thought he would have torn part of one side of it off. At this juncture, one I had not noticed at first came into the scuffle, and poured out on me a volley of the most horrid curses and imprecations (as an Abolitionist) that I ever heard. They of course did me no harm, but I was forced away from the young black, or rather, he was torn down the street so rapidly to the river, that the people who looked on had apparently no time to rescue him from his desperate and armed kidnappers. So, unhappily, he was got on board the boat, and away to Kentucky, and has been hurried away to the South. The affair has excited much indignation. Even our too servile newspapers have denounced it as an outrageous case of kidnapping The young man's name is Jackson, and he had been two or three years at least in this city, part time in a barber's shop, and part time in a restaurant.